

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. IV

JULY, 1919

No. 3

EDITORIAL

BIOGRAPHY IS RIGHTLY COUNTED ONE OF THE MOST profitable kinds of reading. Yet some biographies are discouraging. The brilliant record of a great genius fascinates, but then it brings home most depressingly to the average mind the consciousness of its own limitations. It is therefore distinctly refreshing and inspiring to take up the story of high achievement wrought by one who claimed no spectacular kind of talent, but who did possess the wholesome, substantial gifts of sound judgment and an unflagging will, devoted to conscientious, persistent, painstaking, and fruitful work. The late Dr. Schauffler was long an object of admiration on the part of his many friends and acquaintances because of his almost mysterious ability to wrestle victoriously with hard problems and great practical difficulties, to keep in touch with many and diverse human activities, and to bring things to pass. How was he able to study so much, to speak and write so much, to give so much time to others' needs, and to carry on so much work—and to do all these things so well? Dr. McKinney, his associate in the New York City Mission, reveals the secret in his character sketch of Adolph Frederick Schauffler. Every young man aspiring to the Christian ministry might profit by this simple, direct recital of the habits and

deeds of a man who early learned how to redeem the time and to make the furthering of the interests of his Master the sufficient business of an ardent soul.

IT IS HIGHLY IMPORTANT FOR THE HELMSMAN TO STEER by something surer than the direction of the wind. In Christian thought and life it is just as essential to determine the course by something more certain than current religious opinion. The soul longs for fixed and sure foundations in all things. It is the inherent element of certainty which makes mathematical studies so attractive. But in those vast stretches of experience, impression, and feeling that lie beyond the range of exact logical apprehension the attempt at close definition and scientific proof may easily rob the soul of rightful inheritance. To some extent, our modern demand for scientific demonstration of truth is back of the present confused and hazy, as well as misleading, ideas of the true nature of Christianity; and there is abundant need for the restatement, from time to time, of Christian essentials. In *The Essential Gospel*, Dr. Ramsay endeavors to present such a reminder. Whatever the reader's opinion on any feature of the article, he must respect its calm and moderate style. The strict theologian will hardly approve the relatively small value this writer assigns to theological classifications and definitions in matters of orthodoxy and heterodoxy. Still the sharp distinction which Dr. Ramsay draws between "right belief" and "vital faith" is very real, and needs to be stressed by the pulpit. After all, is it not true, not in a loose or liberal sense but in sound principle, that the supreme test of Christianity is not theological but practical? As he says, "the essence of the Gospel is, that it presents Christ to be known in experience."

A FEW MONTHS AGO, JUST BEFORE HIS DEPARTURE for Turkey, Dr. Barton told in these pages how the war had affected the Mohammedan world. In the present issue Dr. Zwemer gives an account of *The Present Religious Condition of Egypt*. It is a study of one Mohammedan people in the light of recent events, rather than of Mohammedanism generally. The layman in Egyptian history may learn with surprise that "Egypt has always been a land of religious conviction, disputes, and fanatic devotion." Nine-tenths of the people are of the virile, aggressive Mohammedan faith. With them the war has not hurt Christianity, since "warfare generally agrees with their type of mind, and they admire a religion that has fight in it." We learn further that, while Islam still strongly opposes the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, the more intelligent Egyptians are not blind to the moral and social condition of the masses, nor have they failed to observe the superiority of Western, that is Christian, civilization. Hence, with respect to moral reforms, education, and other uplifting social agencies, "educated Moslems are our allies and not our enemies." As the church comes into a more sympathetic understanding of Mohammedan conditions, it will therefore find along the lines of reform a valuable means of approach to the ultimate evangelization of the Egyptian people, difficult as this object now appears.

IT MIGHT BE SAID THAT THE DISPUTE BETWEEN THE thinker and the doer concerns the point where analysis should end and work begin. One may work skillfully and yet have such insufficient knowledge as not even to be able to speak intelligently upon his own vocation or task, and, on the other side, a man may actually think

upon his own line too much to be practical. As one of Dryden's characters says:

I scarcely understand my own intent,
But, silkworm-like, so long within have wrought
That I am lost in my own web of thought.

It is not impossible for a clean and devout person to become so enmeshed in the theory of his Christian belief and work that his practical religious activity is hampered and his influence weakened. Dr. Warfield's clear and judicial consideration of The German Higher Life Movement in Its Chief Exponent must almost inevitably lead the reader to feel that we have, in the attempt of Jellinghaus to define his position exactly, a case of analysis and definition carried to a point where it endangers results. What chance would many pure and consecrated souls have had in their efforts to attain to the fullness of life in Christ, if a prime requirement had been the ability to follow comprehendingly all the windings of a theological discussion upon the exact nature, conditions, and time of sanctification? Such determinations are not only beyond the everyday Christian's interest and grasp, but, as seen in this careful study of the views of Jellinghaus, even the thinker himself becomes entangled in his "own web of thought." At the same time, while this discussion reveals the futility, even peril, of spending too much time on exact delimitations, it brings one to a greater realization of the solemn demands of the Christian life in the matter of high attainment.

NOTHING IS LAUDED MORE THAN TRUTH, AS NOTHING is more hated when it comes as an unbiased revelation of human nature as it is. Hence no facts are more persistently subject to concealment, to distortion or to false and deceptive coloring than those

arising from the thoughts and conduct of men. Not only so, but elements of weakness and of sin seek to cover themselves with the uniform of righteousness. Even when obedience to law becomes custom, and custom becomes tradition, the very tradition itself is prone to degenerate into empty form wherein the seeds of iniquity insidiously find lodgment. That is, a right custom may become both a cloak for unrighteousness and a means of propagating it. We have few writers in this country more keen in moral analysis and more frank and vigorous in expressing their findings than is Dr. William Elliot Griffis. His contribution, *Inherent Falsity and Eternal Truth*, furnishes a new instance of both characteristics. He reminds us that tradition can become a peril, not only by discouraging progressive and comprehensive thinking and living, but also by itself sinking into a sordid means of gain; and further that some of the noblest forms of literature and art may distort human life into a hideous or fantastic caricature. With the chronic human demand for recreation and pleasure and the marvelous facilities of the present time for its gratification, there is abundant room for the wise and courageous words of caution here spoken, and which are the expression of an unusually long life and wide experience.

ONE IS NO LONGER REGARDED AS A HERETIC IF HE VENTURES to believe in the theory of evolution. Of course, there are all shades of evolutionists. To mention extremes, the agnostic type explains all things by the device of a comprehensive system of unswerving natural forces whose progressive results he terms evolution; the Christian evolutionist, on the other hand, sees in these same forces and processes nothing

more than the particular method elected by the Creator for bringing the universe, and more especially our planet, to its present state of development. Plainly the agnostic must always face the baffling problem as to the source of power and of life, while the believer finds the solution in God, the ultimate and universal Source. The singular paradox is that both lines of argument reach the same point, where reason itself fails and must be abandoned for faith—belief in some inexplicable origin, impersonal or personal. That is to say, of two forms of faith you must finally accept that one which appears to you most reasonable. Other questions, however, intrude themselves: Where did God begin to act? and also: May He have intervened since the beginning? Geology is intimately concerned with these inquiries, and has been more prominently associated with the question of evolution, in the popular mind, than has any other branch of science. In Professor Price's paper, *A Closed Question Reopened*, we have what may be called the views of a radical geologist. Whatever the reader may accept or reject, this author's vigorous criticism of the narrow traditionalism of the science in which he specializes is most illuminating. He attacks long accepted geological theories with courageous frankness, and has no hesitation in giving the Creator the place of supreme and overruling power in His world.

R. M. K.

ADOLPH FREDERICK SCHAUFFLER, D.D.

A SUCCESSFUL CHRISTIAN WORKER

By A. H. MCKINNEY, D.D.

A GOOD start means much in life's pilgrimage. Adolph Frederick Schauffler had the advantage of godly parents. He was born in Pera, one of the European suburbs of Constantinople, November 7, 1845. His father, William Gottlieb Schauffler, D.D., L.L.D., was a missionary whose piety, of the old-fashioned ethical and spiritual type, was as unquestioned as his learning. Of the latter there was not the slightest doubt, for he could read and converse in nineteen languages and preach extemporaneously in seven. When he was twenty-two years old he had given himself to Christ. He remained His devoted servant until the end of his long life.

Mary Reynolds, the mother of the subject of this sketch, of Longmeadow, Massachusetts, was of direct Puritan ancestry. She went to Turkey as a missionary. On February 26, 1834, she and Mr. Schauffler were married.

Often have I heard Dr. Schauffler thank God for the blessings of a Christian home. Soon after his birth the family removed to Bebek, a village six miles north of Constantinople, on the Bosphorus, where he remained until the summer of 1863 when he came to the United States to enter Williams College. In this home he learned much from the teachings of his pious father and mother and more from their practical Christian living, coupled with simple dependence upon and unaffected trust in God, who was to them in a most personal way the loving heavenly Father. In his early 'teens Fred, as he was called, settled the question of his loyalty to Christ,

whose untiring follower he continued to be until the day of his death, February 18, 1919. Every time he returned to Bebek he went into the little room where he had made the great surrender and, as he writes, "praised the Lord for the experience through which I passed in my early 'teens."

Dr. Schauffler also had the good fortune of having great teachers, of whom his father was not the least. He often declared that he had the inestimable privilege of being directly under the teaching and influence of Mark Hopkins, President of Williams College. At Andover Theological Seminary he sat under two masters, Professor E. A. Park in systematic theology and Professor Austin Phelps in homiletics. "From these three men," Dr. Schauffler wrote, "I got more of value to me in life than from all my other professors put together."

Some persons have had a good start in life but did not keep up the pace to the end. Not so Dr. Schauffler. On the third day after he stopped working he passed to his reward. One week after his death the Board of Directors of the New York City Mission Society gathered to honor his memory. They adopted an appreciation of this faithful servant of Christ which, after recounting his more than forty-six years of remarkable service for City Mission, contained with others these two paragraphs:

"Abounding as was his work for City Mission, it was only a part of that to which Dr. Schauffler dedicated his head and heart. As a lecturer on Sunday School work he was unrivaled, as a preacher of the Gospel of Christ he was powerful, as a teacher he mightily influenced large numbers of those who in turn teach others, as a writer he was prolific, as a committee man he rendered effective service in many causes, and as a counselor and

friend he exercised an influence that increased in ever-widening circles as he became more trusted and loved.

"Clean-cut in his thinking, true to his convictions, fearless in the performance of duty, faithful to the many trusts committed to him, industrious to an unusual degree, loyal to his friends, Dr. Schauffler was a leader of men through the force of his personality."

What is success in Christian work? If to have brought large numbers of men, women, and children to know, love, and obey God as revealed by Jesus Christ is success; if to have helped many, very many persons to appreciate and understand the Book that tells about God is success; if to have influenced others to a nobler and purer Christian manhood and womanhood is success; if to have inspired numbers to labor and give for the advancement of the Kingdom of God is success, then Dr. Schauffler was successful to a degree attained by very few. Of him it may be fittingly said, Well done good and *successful* servant.

It will be helpful for those engaged in Christian work and for those preparing to take part in the work of the Kingdom to consider some of the elements that entered into Dr. Schauffler's influential life.

At the very core of his life was his trust in his heavenly Father, who is also the Lord God Almighty. He had faith, to be sure; this faith, both intellectual and spiritual, was rooted in conviction which was a resultant of continuous study and experiential knowledge of God. Dr. Schauffler prayed much and he prayed well by whatever canons of criticism his prayers might be tested, but his praying was in order to know God's will that he might do it. "O Lord, if this is right, bring it to pass; if it is not in accordance with thy will, block it," was the gist of much of his praying. Having prayed

thus, he was confidently willing to wait for direction from God. "The Lord reigns" was his oft-repeated declaration in reference to those things which were not easily understood or contrary to what seemed to be for the best.

Industry was another outstanding element in Dr. Schauffler's success as a Christian worker. In him faith and works were united to the superlative degree. Absolute trust in, and child-like dependence upon, God only led him to work the harder. "God will do nothing that you ought to do," was one of his axioms. Hence his industry was phenomenal. This was particularly true in regard to study.

Dr. Schauffler was an exceptional student along general lines. He often narrated this incident of his college days to those whom he suspected of not making the most of their time in regard to reading: "One day in Andover, at our boarding house, I incidentally said: 'I have half a mind to begin Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.' At that one of my classmates burst out laughing and said: 'Yes, that's a fine thing to do, for a man studying as hard as you are.' My reply to him was that I would read the whole six volumes in six weeks, and omit nothing that I was doing then. To this he replied: 'If you do that, I will give you the best oyster supper you ever had.' My answer was, 'Accepted.' I then got to work.

"Instead of spending my time in gossip after meals, I went straight at my book. If I went to Boston, Gibbon went with me. To make a long story short, in the six weeks I had completed the six volumes together with pencil annotations on the whole. Needless to say during these weeks I wasted no precious ten minutes, and also

needless to say, I had the best oyster supper that I had ever enjoyed up till that time."

When aeroplanes were first attracting attention Dr. Schauffler read up on the subject of aeronautics; when Germany began her devilish work with submarines he studied submarines carefully. These are but specimens cited here to indicate how Dr. Schauffler took unending pains to add to his large store of ever-increasing knowledge of subjects of general interest.

It was, however, as a student of the Bible that he devoted himself with unusual zest and diligence. His work as Secretary and later as Chairman of the Lesson Committee of the International Sunday School Association is well known. His lectures at the Bible Teachers Training School and elsewhere on the Bible and Biblical themes were many and in great demand. His preparation for this work was the earnest and continuous study of the Book. He was not content with knowledge obtained from commentaries but delved into the Bible for himself. His own list of "The Greatest Chapters of the Bible" is as follows:

1. Gen. 1, Creation.
2. Ex. 20, The Commandments.
3. Psa. 51, Confession and Prayer.
4. Isa. 53, The Suffering Savior Foretold.
5. Matt. 16, Church Built, etc.
6. Matt. 6, Sermon and Prayer.
7. John 3, The Way of Salvation.
8. Matt. 27, The Crucifixion.
9. Luke 24, The Resurrection and the Ascension.
10. Acts 2, Pentecost.
11. Rom. 8, In Christ Jesus.
12. Rev. 21, The Coming Glory.

He was accustomed to make notes for himself on Biblical subjects, of which the following is a specimen:
 "Rationalistic critics have long ago claimed that the

miracles of the Feeding of the Four Thousand and of the Five Thousand were really one event which the evangelists, through mistake, broadened out into two. There are various arguments that might be presented against this view, but one seems conclusive, and that is drawn from the use of the words translated in English 'baskets.' Two words are used in the Greek. In Matt. 14:20, in Mark 6:43, in Luke 9:17, and in John 6:13, all referring to the Five Thousand, the Greek word is *kophines*. In Matt. 15:37 and in Mark 8:8 in the feeding of the Four Thousand the Greek word is *spirithes*. Now it is most significant that in Matt. 16:9, 10; Mark 8:19, 20 the Lord refers to *both* of these feedings and *holds to the two words above given*. In the feeding of the Five Thousand he says that they gathered up *kophines* of the fragments and in his reference to the feeding of the Four Thousand that they gathered up *spirithes*. This shows that there was a marked difference in the *kind of baskets* that were used on these two occasions. This indicates strongly the entire separateness of the two miracles."

Once, when a religious periodical was urging its readers to pray to Jesus, Dr. Schauffler said: "The Bible teaches us to pray to God, the Father, in the name of Jesus, in the Holy Spirit." Then, to ascertain whether his statement was correct or not, he took his Bible and from it made out the following:

List of passages in the New Testament referring to prayer to the divine Being, and indicating whether it was addressed to God or the Lord:

Acts 1:24	Lord	Eph. 3:14	Father
Acts 4:24	God	Eph. 5:20	God
Acts 7:59, 60	Jesus. Stephen saw Jesus	Phil. 1:3	God
Rom. 1:8, 9	God	Phil. 4:6	God
Rom. 6:17	God	Col. 1:3	God
Rom. 7:25	God	Col. 1:12	Father
Rom. 8:15	God	Col. 3:17	God and Father
	Father	1 Thess. 1:2	God

Rom. 10:13	Lord.O.T.quo-	1 Thess. 2:13	God
	tation Joel 2:32	1 Thess. 3:9	God
Rom. 15:30	God	2 Thess. 1:3	God
1 Cor. 1:4	God	2 Thess. 1:11	God
1 Cor. 15:57	God	2 Thess. 2:13	God
2 Cor. 2:14	God	2 Tim. 1:3	God
2 Cor. 9:11	God	Philemon 4	God
2 Cor. 9:15	God	Heb. 7:25	God
2 Cor. 12:8	Lord	Heb. 13:15	God
2 Cor. 13:7	God	James 1:5	God
Gal. 4:6	Father	1 Pet. 1:17	Father
Eph. 1:16-17	God	1 John 3:21, 22	God

Dr. Schauffler prepared a booklet entitled: *Life and Work of Christ Reconstructed Exclusively from the Epistles*. He has this to say concerning this reconstruction: "The study, the results of which are here presented, was entered upon in consequence of a suggestion offered by Professor Sitterly, of Drew Theological Seminary, in a series of lectures delivered by him before a Sunday-school audience, on the Life of Christ. His suggestion was that a Life of Christ should be prepared by his hearers based only on the utterances of the Apostles as given in the Epistles. 'How much,' he asked, 'would we have of the Life of Christ left if the Four Gospels and the Acts were absolutely lost?' This suggestion the writer took up and, in the midst of a thousand distractions, pursued from time to time. He much regrets that the presentation is not more ably made, but with the time at his disposal he has done the best he could."

Study of the Bible in general was intensified by especial preparation to teach, lecture or preach on a Biblical theme or a selected portion of Scripture. A keen business man, who was a very successful Sunday School superintendent, attended Dr. Schauffler's Saturday afternoon class for the study of the International Uniform Lessons. This was his testimony: "I attended Dr. Schauffler's Bible class for many years, and I never heard

him teach a lesson that he did not give evidence that he had made special preparation to teach that particular lesson. He never came before his class unprepared for the work of the hour."

To his study of the Bible in general and the especial study of the lesson he was about to teach, this unrivaled teacher added the most painstaking efforts to become proficient in presenting the truth. He believed that much depended on the *manner* in which truth was presented. He was, therefore, an indefatigable student of methods of teaching. In his earlier days in New York he visited the Normal College and listened to and watched skilful, expert teachers instruct others. Then he would endeavor to apply what he had seen and heard to his own work as teacher and preacher. He traveled the city over to get new ideas on the content and the methods of teaching. When he attended conventions of Sunday School workers as a leader and a most helpful speaker, he listened eagerly and appreciatively to others for the purpose of getting something that he might adapt for the improvement of his own work.

Dr. Schauffler was a conspicuous specimen of "the noblest work of God"—an honest man. So ingrained was his honesty that he did not suspect guile or deceit in others; hence, he was sometimes "taken in" by those whom he trusted. The discovery that his trust had been abused caused him real grief. No one could be more exact in his dealings with others. One result of his exactness was that he was loved and trusted to an unusual degree.

His honesty compelled Dr. Schauffler to be accurate. At a service held in his honor Dr. A. W. Halsey, a long-time friend, referred to this accuracy in these words: "One of the essential elements of efficiency is *accuracy*.

Dr. Schauffler was one of the most accurate men I ever knew. He was a factful man. He devoured facts, but he had to be well assured as to the accuracy of a statement before he made it. He knew the exact height of the Woolworth Building, the gallons of water flowing over Niagara, the time it took in years for light to travel from the most distant star. His quotations from the Bible were accurate and exact. Next to the Bible he loved the book of nature and he twined these two volumes of revelation into a harmony and symmetry that was most effective in presenting the truth. Men who heard him give facts in physics, in chemistry, in astronomy, in geography and found them to be accurate reasoned that he had thought through problems of religion, and when he stated a religious fact or experience he was stating that which was as true to him as a fact in nature. This gave him power and accounts largely for the sweep of his influence over all sorts and conditions of men."

This habit of accuracy joined with his great industry made Dr. Schauffler most painstaking in his preparation for teaching. For example, not content with merely saying: "These are the non-canonical books mentioned in the Old Testament," he compiled and kept for reference a list of these books as follows:

Book of the Wars of the Lord	Num. 21:14
Book of Jashar	Josh. 10:13
	2 Sam. 1:18
Acts of Solomon	1 Kings 11:41
Book of Kings of Israel	
Sayings of the Seers	2 Chron. 33:18
Chronicles of the Kings of Judah	
Book of Samuel the Seer	1 Chron. 29:29
Book of Nathan the Prophet	1 Chron. 29:29
	2 Chron. 9:29
Book of Gad the Seer	1 Chron. 29:29
Chronicles of King David	1 Chron. 27:24
Prophecy of Abijah the Shilonite	2 Chron. 9:29
Vision of Iddo the Seer	2 Chron. 9:29

Book of Shemaiah the Prophet	2 Chron. 12:15
Book of Iddo the Seer (concerning genealogies)	2 Chron. 12:15
Commentary of the Prophet Iddo	2 Chron. 13:22
Book of Jehu	2 Chron. 20:34
Acts of Uzziah by Isaiah	2 Chron. 26:22
1005 Songs of Solomon	1 Kings 4:32

There was a noteworthy life practice of Dr. Schauffler which could be imitated with inestimable advantage by every teacher and preacher working for the advancement of the Kingdom of God. He read with discrimination. He would not read works of fiction because he feared the weakening effects of such literature on his receptive mind, and he held that he had time only for the best. Again, when he explored a subject he read widely and deeply, so that he might get many viewpoints. For example he read one hundred and fifty volumes dealing with the Great War, in addition to what he culled from newspapers, magazines, and pamphlets, so that he might be fully informed on the subject. But this is the most important point to be borne in mind by those who would follow in the footsteps of this well-read, well-informed Christian worker: He never read hurriedly nor with part of his mind. He could read rapidly, but he always read critically with pencil ready for use. Sometimes he made his comments on the margin of the page he was reading; at other times he read with paper near at hand so that he could jot down his criticisms and conclusions; at other times he would write out a summary of the results of his reading in order to make comparisons with other conclusions he had recorded. When he met something that was not clear or with which he did not agree, he did not hesitate to take time to write to the author for light. If he received a reply it was carefully considered. Sometimes a book that had been laid aside would be reread and revalued in the light of additional facts or change in circumstances.

Is it astonishing that he was well-informed, that he was ready in conversation and public speaking, that he wielded a facile pen? What was evident in regard to his readiness on many and varied occasions was the result, in a very large measure, of his discriminating, critical reading. He who will may follow the example of this trained reader and thus become better fitted for the work to which he devoted his life.

Dr. Schauffler was a radical in methods but a conservative in theology. With his intellectual make-up he could not be narrow-minded. His open-mindedness was evident to those who knew him well. He was always willing to investigate anything new, even when it was in opposition to his settled convictions. Once when the age of the earth was being discussed, he consulted various authorities, and one morning he handed the writer a sheet of paper headed: "Date of the Earth's Existence," on which he had jotted down some of the results of his study. As the dates of the scientists varied from 30,000,000 years to 1,400,000,000, he concluded that he would wait a while before he made any public assertions as to the age of our planet. This determination to wait for light was strengthened by the fact that in his study as to the age of the earth he had learned that the estimate of time required for the "Pleocene Pact Deposits" varied from 34,000,000 years to 400,000,000 years, according to the authority consulted. Had he found agreement among those best qualified to write on the subject, he would have welcomed the truth and proclaimed it with his inimitable clearness and force, although it put an end to some of his beliefs. His readiness to accept and teach what is true, irrespective of what he had once believed, was characteristic of this great teacher and makes clear

his hold upon men, which constrained them to accept and follow his leadership.

Sympathy, that rare quality, which is so different from pity or patronage, was a marked feature in Dr. Schauffler's successful ministry. His sympathy was the natural fruitage of love and experience. He loved people, but he did not waste any time in talking about love; his life was love in action. He studied people in their great racial groupings and knew their general characteristics, but he also studied people as individuals. He made helpful use of his varied and long experience with all sorts and conditions of men. His love, knowledge, and experience made it possible for him to be a friend indeed. He was always giving—now advice, now encouragement, again inspiration, often money if that was what would do the most good. The following is what one who had good reason to remember his sympathy wrote when he heard that he had gone to his reward:

"Dr. Schauffler was a great man in the fullest sense of the word, intellectually, morally, spiritually. But those of us who had the privilege of working with him will always remember him as a real, true, and big friend. He was a refuge, a comfort, and an inspiration; one who knew how to make one's load easier and lighter. His generosity knew no bounds. He had learned to perfection the rare and divine art of helping without humiliating. No matter how complicated or unpleasant the problem or how vexing the question, he would dig with wonderful patience and love into his marvelous store of experience and find a solution. Nothing was too small nor too trivial for thoughtful attention. As we went to him, we felt that we were pouring out our troubles or our needs to one who would make them his own and take a personal interest, to one who had learned how to

bear others' burdens. His spirit was the spirit of the Christ. His memory will be fragrant and sweet, in time and eternity."

Dr. Schauffler's ability to make himself understood by others has been commented upon by many. Preachers and teachers studied him in order to discover, if possible, the secret of his extraordinary power in this respect. The secret may be summed up in one sentence: He was willing to pay the price. What this price was, doubtless the reader has already concluded from the foregoing. This great teacher and preacher's power resulted from his tireless industry, which led him to study as few men do, from his absolute honesty, which was manifested in accuracy and open-mindedness, from his sympathy with all kinds of people, which fitted him to know what they needed and to give it to them in personal talks, in lectures, sermons, and many writings. He studied nature, he studied things, he studied books, especially *the Book*, he studied people, he studied methods. He submitted results of his studies to the processes of his alert, well-trained mind and to the test of experience. He prayed much and earnestly for illumination and for the help of the Holy Spirit. There is no secret as to Dr. Schauffler's ability to make himself clear to others. He paid the price, and became a master. One reason for writing this sketch is that others engaged in preaching and teaching may be helped by a study of those factors which, when combined, resulted in a great teacher. An illustration or two of just how he prepared himself for his life work may be apropos.

When Dr. Schauffler began his work at Olivet Chapel he very much desired that his people should develop physically and mentally as well as morally and spiritually. To help in their development he planned series

after series of lectures to be given on week evenings. He spent much time in going to different parts of the city to secure lecturers. Among others he prevailed upon eminent physicians to instruct the Oliveters in physiology and hygiene. He soon came to the conclusion that these learned gentlemen understood their subjects, but talked "over the heads" of their auditors. Dr. Schauffler considered the matter from different standpoints and finally determined that he would give the lectures. Accordingly he secured a skeleton, charts, and books. He studied diligently, obtained suggestions from experts, and lectured on the human body, its care, cleanliness, etc. And the people understood. He knew his subject, but he knew more—he was well acquainted with those to whom he lectured, and he had learned how to present facts and truths so that they could be apprehended, remembered, and applied in everyday life. Think of a preacher surpassing eminent physicians in the latter's own field of study! This is exactly what Dr. Schauffler did. It cost him much to do so, but he was more than recompensed both in the results accomplished with others and in the knowledge and skill acquired by himself.

The undertaker who had charge of his funeral exclaimed: "Did you ever hear Dr. Schauffler lecture on astronomy? When I was a young fellow I used to attend his lectures at Olivet. He was great on astronomy." Many similar illustrations could be given to indicate how Dr. Schauffler made himself clear to those whom he instructed. In every case he made careful and appropriate preparation for his teaching in whatever form it was given.

Another feature of Dr. Schauffler's life was his helpfulness to others. In how many ways and to how many persons he ministered it would be impossible to enumer-

ate. This ministry began in his boyhood and extended to within a few days of death at the age of seventy-three years. Concerning his seventieth birthday Dr. Schauffler wrote:

"Chief among my causes of gratitude for my Seventieth Birthday were the acknowledgments from very many that I have been a help to them in the past in making clear to them the Word of God, and in encouraging them in their Christian lives. For this I am devoutly thankful to my Heavenly Father. My effort always has been to build up those to whom I minister in their knowledge of and obedience to the Word of the Living God.

"I really think that I can say that Sunday, November 7, was on the whole the happiest day of my life. My rooms were full of flowers sent by loving friends; my table spilt over with letters and telegrams; and my heart sang all day a joyous song of praise Godward and gratitude manward."

Here is a summary of Dr. Schauffler's helpfulness, written by one of his nephews:

"Through his indefatigable writing, his preaching, his teaching and his personal contact in conferences, committees and on boards of many kinds, Dr. Schauffler influenced a constituency throughout this country and other lands which it is impossible to estimate. His fearlessness of soul, his integrity and sincerity, his keen understanding and hearty championship of the common people, his great love for children, and his deep spirituality have made an indelible impress upon a host of friends who, while mourning their own loss, rejoice in the memory and power of his triumphant life."

From many this testimony has been selected, as expressing much in few words:

"Words fail to convey my sorrow at the news of the death of my very dear friend—Dr. Schauffler.

"Oh, he was so good and so helpful to me in many ways ever since childhood—and to others, too. I am quite sure that you, too, will mourn the loss of such a loyal and sincere brother. If a monument were to be placed over his grave and its height measured by his good deeds, it would reach to heaven."

"The man of common sense knows what to do now." Dr. Schauffler was pre-eminently this man, for he knew what to do. He could turn from one task to another, from one line of thought to another, with easy rapidity. His common sense made him much sought after for counsel and advice. He became the helpful friend of many persons because he was so well fitted to tell them just what to do in the confronting duty or emergency. His work on committees and directorates was of unusual value because his common sense coupled with a rare unselfishness showed him the best course to pursue for the long run. Simulation and dissimulation were not in his make-up. Therefore, when, after considering all known factors in a case, he announced his decision, those who had worked longest with him knew that what he said was based on experience and common sense. Some persons not so well acquainted with him were disposed to hold that he rendered his decisions arbitrarily and hastily, but the longer time they had to test their practicality and appropriateness, the more they became inclined to confess that he was right. Those who were associated with him in considering intricate problems and preparing for difficult situations leaned heavily on him, for they had come to realize that his practical understanding would help him to decide what was best to be done in a given case. If others accepted his decision, he was gratified; if not,

he simply bided his time until they would change their minds.

Dr. Schauffler's diary, under date of January 1, 1919, contains these words:

"In God's name forward."

This sentiment is all the more impressive because it was intended for the eyes of the writer only. But now that he has gone "forward" into the better and larger life it is most significant to us who remain. It shows the motive power of a remarkable life and may be adopted by anyone who is longing to be a successful Christian worker. To Dr. Schauffler God was first and supreme; with His help there was nothing impossible; without Him there was nothing worth while. He went forward even unto the end here. Who dare say that he is not going forward there and will continue to go forward throughout the endless ages of eternity?

NEW YORK.

THE ESSENTIAL GOSPEL

By REV. F. P. RAMSAY, Ph.D.

THERE has always been a tendency to depart from revealed truth. Old Testament history is a history of such departures. The ministry of Jesus was largely a protest against rejection and corruption of the truth, especially by the Pharisees. And the apostles had to oppose and warn against rising heresies within the body of those who professed the Christian faith. From their day to this the history of the church in all its branches has been a history of repeated departures from the essential principles of the Christian faith and of efforts to preserve this faith from perversion and extinction.

Nor would the history of the past lead us to expect the truth to be found with the majority and the error with the minority, or the truth with those in control and the error with those of more or less questionable standing. Of course, every sort of error has been held by noisy and troublesome minorities; but quite often the great and regular majority has lost the essential truth. Whether, then, one belongs to the regular majority, the orthodox, or to a censured minority, the heterodox, let one not assume in pride that the truth is with him and despise others. Let each one in humility be willing to ask himself whether he is not himself losing the right way.

And if in our time we find much of confusion about what Christianity is, and of distrust of one another among those who all claim to accept the Gospel, we must not be surprised; nor must we attribute all this confusion and distrust to the war. The stress of the war could only

bring out what was already latent in the mind of our time. The war could not create a new gospel or a new interpretation of the Gospel, but it might hasten the definite expression of beliefs that otherwise would have remained unarticulated. To understand what has been taking place in religious thought under stress of war conditions, we must begin with religious thought as it was at the beginning of the war.

That, in one word, was a contest between the old and the new. On the one hand had been authority, the authority of the church, of the Bible, of the past; and on the other hand, insurrection against authority in order to find place for the new views. This contest had already resulted in victory for the new to this extent, that the new views had obtained standing in the regular church and also in certain subsidiary organizations, and were largely in control of the forces that produce opinion, the schools and the press, through the conversion of the rich to the support of the new views with their wealth and power. The war came when modernism was about to become traditionalism, and was rapidly displacing the old tradition from position and place and assuming its authority.

But the lines of distinction between the old and the new were not clearly drawn. Converts to the new carried over with them the life and even the beliefs they had inherited, mixed them with new impulses and beliefs that they did not fully and exactly distinguish, and oft-times were unconsciously living the old life under the new dress. Adherents of the old unawares imbibed of the new, breathed it in from all the atmosphere of current literature and education, and sometimes were unconsciously living the new life under the old dress.

Some of the points of real difference loosely distinguishing the two tendencies or schools were these: The old held to the Bible as authority, and sought still to appeal to its voice as final, but the new was afraid of authority, challenged this authority of the Bible in the name of criticism, and appealed to science and psychology; the old put emphasis upon revivals and conversion and conscious cataclysms in experience, but the new put emphasis upon education and culture, and consequently the new became generally superior in scholarship; and the old, largely, came into sympathy with views suggested by the term premillenarianism, while the new was tending to explain away the Second Coming or to deny it altogether. In one thing there was agreement, social service, in which the new engaged with enthusiasm and the old was unwilling to come behind.

Such was the situation at the beginning of the war; and now both schools are seeking vindication in the tests to which the war has subjected them. In patriotism, in social service, in every sort of ministry to want and suffering, the two wings are equal. The new wing is perhaps becoming less insistent on its repudiation of authority and less extreme in setting aside the authority of the Bible, and the old is perhaps becoming more appreciative of the resistless demands of the human soul. The new is finding more importance in sudden change of mind in religious experience, and the old, more importance in religious education. The new is feeling the want of a great hope, like the hope of the Second Coming, and the old is finding it more difficult to hold to any definite schedule of the future. Possibly the present is as favorable a time as ever can be for searching out the real essence of our religion and discovering it to both

schools, in the hope of uniting those who really hold the essence as against those who really deny the essence.

Who knows what will follow this war? Industrial and social and political and religious revolutions and wars incomparably fiercer than the military struggle may break out now that the tension of the Great War is relieved. One cannot predict. It certainly is timely to attempt some little contribution toward answering the most pressing religious question of our time, What is the essence of the Gospel?

The writer has lately been hearing and reading the extremists and the moderates of both schools and comparing their views; has been searching into his own system of beliefs, seeking to divine the essential element in his own faith; and above all has been asking anew from the Scriptures what the Gospel really is. If his statement is inaccurate or one-sided, others may point out its imperfections, all thus working together to help one another to a clearer understanding and expression of the really essential element in our common faith, the Gospel. For he is writing as one among believers to believers in the Gospel, seeking to fix heart and word upon its distinctive and essential element.

We may come at our quest psychologically. Is the essential thing in the Gospel something directed especially at our feelings and emotions, something to give us pleasure, as esthetic pleasure or religious joy? Most of those who read this article are as ready as the writer to answer this question with an emphatic negative. Yet we must not go too far; for unless the Gospel does give us pleasure of a kind, such deeper satisfaction as the words peace and joy indicate, the Gospel will be to us a failure. The essential Gospel must bring its own thrill and ecstasy at times, and its own permanent and in-

effable satisfaction and gladness. But not here need we search for its essence, for other religions can intoxicate their devotees with religious ecstasy, and delusions can fill with happiness.

Is the essential thing in the Gospel something directed especially at our desires and volitions, and through them at our actions and conduct? To this question the answer is not easy. The essential Gospel will reach the conduct through the will, creating right motive and character to be the source and guide of action. But conduct toward our fellow men may, in outward action and in inner motive of kindness and justice, apart from the Gospel, become indistinguishable from Christian kindness and justice. Even toward God men without the Gospel may show such a humility and devoutness, and such a thirst for God, or, in other words, such piety, as must challenge admiration in comparison with Christian piety. We may claim that there is a distinct and superior quality in Christian morality and piety, but how can we substantiate this claim to good people who are not Christians? And if other faiths can produce as fine and beautiful character and life as our Christian faith, then the essential thing in the Gospel is not its power to produce such character and life, but this power plus some difference between it and other faiths that are its equals in this production, its equals in so far saving men.

That difference must lie, not in the desires and volitions and consequent character and conduct produced by the Gospel, if its product is only equal to that of other faiths, but in the different beliefs which the Gospel creates and which in turn issue in character and conduct; and if really Christian character and conduct are different from the character and conduct produced by any other faith, and superior thereto, as the writer and most

of his readers are persuaded, still the difference must be sought in the difference in the beliefs. Back, then, to these beliefs we must go in our quest for the essential element of the Gospel which engenders these beliefs. Here we must not deceive ourselves with words. Desires and volitions in their quality of being right and wrong are inseparable from the beliefs. Motive has belief in it, and motive determines the quality of action. If, then, genuine and distinctive Christian life is really different from the life of other faiths, this difference is due to some difference in the beliefs as well as to some difference in the volitions. Thinking of the Gospel as addressed to our judgment especially, we must ask what is the essential belief or system of beliefs proposed to us by the Gospel.

But if we go back to the beliefs, we cannot stop with them and refuse to go back to the experiences of immediate knowing in which the beliefs arise, so far as they are not mere inferences. For a belief is either an inference or arises in immediate knowledge. Thus we shall come to the essential thing in the Gospel: That it presents to us, as the object of our conscious experience of immediate knowing, some reality such that this immediate knowing of it becomes the root of beliefs and volitions, of a life having its own peculiar quality, a quality unlike that of any other sort of life.

But what can become to us the object of immediate knowledge, of conscious experience? Some will answer, the processes of our own mind, our own activities and emotions. Prominent here would be the sense of sin, including guilt and pollution and powerlessness—the conviction of sin. But conviction of sin can be of no value unless as preparation for its remission and abandonment; and if we distinguish, the essential thing in the

Gospel is not so much what convicts of sin as what shows escape from it. Surely the Gospel must have a more important office than to show me myself; for there is something far more important than myself.

Some would answer, the Holy Spirit in His impressions and influences upon the human spirit. But apart from the question whether we can immediately know the Holy Spirit, it lies obvious on the face of the New Testament that the Gospel is not primarily and essentially a message concerning the Holy Spirit. Rather the Gospel is used by the Holy Spirit, not to glorify Himself, but to glorify Another.

Just here it is we come to the essential element in the Gospel, Jesus Christ. But can Christ become the object of our immediate knowledge? Can we experience Christ? This is precisely the distinctive office of the Holy Spirit, to present Christ to us. The Gospel is the means the Spirit uses for making this presentation. And this is the essential Gospel, the presentation of Christ to the human soul for its immediate knowledge and experience.

If any arise to deny vigorously the possibility of our immediate knowledge of Christ, and to label the claim of such conscious experience as seeing or knowing Christ with deprecatory terms like fanaticism and mysticism, we can only cite the testimonies of men of all schools of Christian belief, and rest in the fact that men do thus know Christ. We thus claim the same experience as Jesus promised and the apostles knew: "He that loveth me * * *, I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him. * * * And my Father will love him, and we will come to him, and make our abode with him." (John 14:21-23). *Cf.* "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (v. 9). "This is life eternal, that they should

know thee, the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ" (John 17:3). "Till we all attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God" (Eph. 4:13). "That I may know him" (Phil. 3:13). Fruitful "unto the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. 1:8). "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any one hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me" (Rev. 3:20).

If men do not have this sort of experience of Christ now, then the original Christianity has died out; and if such experience of Christ is possible, then that in the Gospel which makes it possible is the essential element in the Gospel. Beliefs about Christ, but not rooted in such experience of Him, are lifeless and fruitless; but beliefs rooted in such experience grow into Christlike motives, Christlike desires and volitions, and Christlike character and conduct, and ripen into the peace and joy of Christ. Hence the essence of the Gospel is that it presents Christ to us to be thus known in experience.

Objections to this conclusion may come from two directions, from one direction that this puts too much into the essence of the Gospel, and from another that it puts too little.

It may be objected that to put immediate knowledge of Christ into the essence of what the Gospel offers is to assume His present existence, and hence His resurrection, for He could not now be immediately known if He did not now really exist. This is perfectly good logic, for only the now living Christ could now be known. But this precisely is what the Gospel asserts as central and crucial to its own validity. Take away the resurrection of Christ, and Christians are of all deluded men the most pitiable. We deal with the living Christ, and it is

of the essence of the Gospel to offer Him to our immediate apprehension.

If anyone thinks that we are saved by ideas and beliefs, independently of any reality, he holds a philosophy that contradicts Christianity and makes its Gospel a delusion. Such a philosophy professors may hold while their salaries are secure and their health is good, but in the valleys of sorrow and on the hills of agony, in the fierce strains and flames of human suffering and battle, when men are in war to the death for their very souls, their satisfying Saviour must be a known reality, and not an imaginary conception. In any case, a gospel is no gospel at all that does not bring us a living Christ.

It may be objected that to put immediate knowledge of Christ into the essence of what the Gospel offers us is to imply the Deity of Christ and to deny the name of Christian to Unitarians. Here we must be careful of our words. What precisely is the difference between Unitarians and Trinitarians? Very few of either could intelligently state the precise difference; and a real Unitarian might mistakenly classify himself as a Trinitarian, and a real Trinitarian might mistakenly classify himself as a Unitarian. But to know Christ is the essential thing. And if Christ is able to make Himself the object of immediate knowledge to millions of men of all times and places, and to be in communion with them, He is not mere man, but is God to them. If in this experience of Him they come to have that mind toward Him which men may properly have toward Deity, then they honor the Son as they honor the Father, however illy or well they define the metaphysical distinctions involved.

If, however, any intelligently deny to Christ the power of thus manifesting Himself, and mean all that this denial logically involves, they contradict the certain

teaching of the New Testament and the faith as it has been held by the Christians from the beginning, and they cannot, if language is to be used with scientific exactness, be called Christians.

And it may be objected that, to put immediate knowledge of Christ into the essence of what the Gospel offers us, is to shut out from salvation all who do not enjoy this immediate knowledge of Christ. Even if this exclusion be guarded and limited to mean that they are not in a state of salvation while thus ignorant of Christ, without meaning that they may not come into a state of salvation later by coming thus to know Him, it still is, the objector may say, narrow and bigoted for any to claim that none are among the saved except those who have their type of experience. Or the objector may urge that there are multitudes in possession of the salvation which the Gospel offers and yet are without this immediate knowledge of Christ.

Salvation may be claimed on the ground of sacramental union with Christ. But if any can be saved by such sacramental union without the vital union, then this sacramental union with Christ is the essential thing offered in the Gospel. Therefore our answer to this contention must be a simple denial of the theory that any can come into a state of salvation by baptism or other sacraments without vital faith apprehending Christ Himself, of the theory that any with the vital faith ever perish through mere lack of some ceremony, and of the theory that some ceremony is necessary as a cause or condition of this vital faith. Sacraments may aid in inaugurating or continuing the essential thing, union with Christ by faith, but they cannot be essential, and much more they cannot be sufficient to begin it or to preserve it. But there is no need to argue this with our

readers, who, for the most part, are already fixed in the conviction that no sacramental regularity can save men.

Salvation may be claimed on the ground of right belief. But to substitute right belief for vital faith is as contrary to the Gospel as to substitute sacramental regularity for vital faith. Such right belief may help to the vital faith, but cannot save without the vital faith. There may come the vital faith where the right belief is absent, for the vital faith appears in thousands who are at various degrees of distance from right belief. Some element of right belief, that is, of truth, may be necessary to this faith, logically or psychologically speaking; but, if so, it is impossible to formulate this necessary minimum of truth. The orthodox may be out of Christ, the heterodox may be in Christ. Hence neither orthodoxy nor any definable minimum of orthodoxy is the essential thing.

Or salvation may be claimed on the ground of a right life. There are multitudes of nominal Christians who honestly endeavor to live clean lives, practicing the teachings of our Lord, and attain to some degree of success in so living, but who have no conscious experience of Christ. They live a moral life of no mean excellence, and some of them are faithful also in observing the requirements of religion; they show a Christian morality and piety, the fruits of the Gospel, but have no religious experience to report. Now, says the objector, shall these multitudes of good people not be pronounced saved, not be recognized as having the essential thing which the Gospel offers?

Our answer must be an unequivocal negative. There are many such decent people where Christianity has never gone. In fact, the great majority of men and women live decent lives in all countries and religions, complying with the requirements of the religion and

morality of their time and place. They fail, it is true, of perfection even according to their accepted standards, as do Christians of the deepest experience; but they are sincerely good people rather than bad people. Seeing that such lives are produced without the Gospel, that element in the Gospel which produces them cannot be its essence.

Or, once more, it may be objected that there are many who have faith in Christ, the will's commitment of oneself to Him and not a mere belief of the judgment about Him, and in this faith love Him and obey Him, and hence live in Christ so far as their judgment and will are concerned, and yet have no immediate knowledge of Him, no conscious experience of His presence. In this unseeing faith they become like Christ in motive and character, and in inner temper and outer conduct. They show a distinctively Christlike sort of life, but are yet without any immediate knowledge of Him. They are made like Him by their ideas and conceptions, and by their beliefs and purposes concerning Him.

To this objection our answer must be, that it is here supposed that these persons accept Christ, with will as well as judgment, and so open the door of life to Him but that He does not come in. This supposition we disallow. These persons have conscious experience of Christ, immediate knowledge, without being able to name that which they thus know. As one may become warm by heat from a radiator, without noticing that the radiator is present, although he has immediate experience of its presence; so one may be the subject of immediate apprehension of Christ, without recognizing that his experience is an immediate knowing of Christ. Yet if the radiator were not really present, the experience would not come; and if Christ were not really pres-

ent, the experience would not come. In the one case the person would not become warm; in the other he would not become Christlike.

Now this immediate knowledge of Christ, which is proved by its making the subject Christlike, is the essential thing, not intelligence to explain the experience and give it the right name. This conscious experience of Him, this vital faith through which He flows into the believer and lives in him, this is the one essential of salvation in us; and the one essential in the Gospel is that it does present Christ to us to be thus immediately known in conscious experience. Leave this out, and the distinct essence of the Gospel is wanting.

From the other direction the objection may come that this conclusion puts too little into the essence of the Gospel. The objectors may say, that here is no social life and service, no brotherhood of believers, and no organized church with its discipline and worship and sacraments; that here is no standard of morality and uprightness of life; that here is no guide to right volitions and no impulsion to right desires; and that here is no security of right doctrines and beliefs. This minimum essence, they may say, does not require acceptance of the Scriptures, of the plan of salvation, or even of the Deity of our Lord.

Our reply is ready and adequate. If Christ is in His own, in immediate touch with them and known to them in their conscious experience, He unerringly guides them into the truth. In thus knowing Him they get that truth which grows immediately out of such knowledge into a harmonious system of right beliefs, or at least toward such a system; for they experience Him as what He is, and are thus directed to right beliefs about Him. So they experience salvation, and are thus directed into

apprehension of its real nature, as God's grace of justification in the crucified Christ and as God's grace of life in the living Christ. They experience the adequacy of Scripture as a means of introducing Christ, and are thus directed to insight into its inspiration. This knowledge of Christ is the source of right beliefs, growing as a system out of this root; the living Christ within is the security of orthodoxy. And if He is dwelling in us, the fountain of right beliefs, He is through them and in His own motions the fountain of right desires and right volitions, the source of right character and conduct, the ever outflowing of Christliness into all the capacities and faculties of the individual and of the brotherhood. The church can never perish with Christ alive in its members.

The limits of this article permit only a few brief reflections. The first is that we may put away anxiety for the preservation of the truth. Whatever place may belong to creed and church, to argument and testimony, or to any other means and agencies for promoting and preserving the truth against corruption and error, yea, whatever place may be given to the Bible, the one security of the truth, of revealed truth, of the truth entrusted to the church, is Christ ever making Himself known to those who accept Him in their ever renewed experience of Him. As long as Christ gives Himself to His own to be immediately known by them in their conscious experience, so long will the truth concerning Him be winning the victory in the contest with error. The indwelling Christ is the Saviour of the intellect.

Christians are now divided into organizations according to their beliefs, their formulated beliefs. Would it be possible to make mutual recognition of one another as the organs of the indwelling Christ the basis of organization?

Finally, important as it is to examine and weigh evidence, to arrive at right beliefs and to give them adequate expression, and to indoctrinate in the truth, is it not even more important to the truth itself, to Christian truth, to know in conscious experience Christ and by this knowing to become like Him?

NEW YORK.

THE PRESENT RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF EGYPT

By Rev. SAMUEL M. ZWEMER, D.D., Editor, *The Moslem World*

EGYPT is a Bible land to which there are more than five hundred references in the Old and New Testaments. Christ found refuge in Egypt. The early church there had its martyrs and missionaries. It is a land of surpassing interest to the archeologist, the tourist, and the missionary. During the war it proved of strategic importance to the Allies. It has always been the key to North Africa and is the keystone in the arch of Moslem lands from Tangier to Teheran. Its importance after the war can only be surmised from the action of the Peace Conference. Cairo is the intellectual capital of the Moslem world.

Egypt has always been a land of religious conviction, disputes, and fanatic devotion. One may read the religious character of the Egyptian not only in Eber's *Bride of the Nile* and Kingsley's *Hypatia*, but also in the faces of the students today at El Azhar, the Moslem university, and the type of the religious devotee remains constant.

Almost from the beginning of her history Egypt has been under foreign influence, overrun in turn by Ethiopian, Persian, Greek, Roman, Arab, and Turk. These nations, one after the other, have ruled as masters, and the people in consequence have developed some of the characteristics of a servile race. Only since the British occupation has Egypt begun to find herself. In the words of a Moslem sheikh who wrote to Lord Cromer in 1906:

He must be blind who does not see what the English have wrought in Egypt; the gates of justice stand open to the poor; the streams flow through the land and are not stopped by order of the strong; the poor man is lifted up and the rich man pulled down; the hand of the oppressor and the briber is struck when outstretched to do evil. Our eyes see these things and know from whom they come.

In speaking of the present religious condition of Egypt we cannot forget the effect of the war, and yet the war has produced only superficial changes in the thought life of the Moslem world. Islam denies, and always must deny while it remains Islam, seven truths which are vital to Christian thought: The authority of the Scriptures, the Deity of our Lord, the cruciality of the cross, the need of an atonement for sin, the sanctity of the home, liberty of conscience, and the supremacy of Christ over against Mohammed. It is this denial that is the yawning chasm between Islam and Christianity in creed and ethics and reveals the religious problem of Egypt, for it goes without saying that Egypt is Moslem.

The Moslems constitute more than nine-tenths of the whole population. They are the most neglected class, and often at the same time the most inaccessible. Among 635,012 Bedouins of Egypt there is practically no missionary work, and of the 10,269,449 Mohammedans it is the judgment of those who know the facts most thoroughly that the existing agencies of all missions do not in any way reach more than 1,000,000; and of 3,621 towns and villages not more than 380 have any regular mission work. Cairo, "the victorious," as its name signifies, is at once the capital of Egypt, the metropolis of all Africa, and the brain center of the Moslem world. With a Moslem population nearly twice as large as that of Stamboul and larger than that of any other Moslem city in the world, its influence is steadily growing, not only throughout North Africa but

throughout the nearer East. Its statistics of population, its architectural monuments, educational institutions, municipal government, street cries, and street signs and daily life, make it evident to even the casual observer that this is a thoroughly Moslem city. Of the fifteen quarters into which the vast city is divided there is only one-quarter, the Esbekieh (and here is the American Mission building), where non-Moslems are in the majority; and even this quarter contains 13,000 Moslems, compared with 14,000 Copts. In the Darb-ul-Ahmar quarter there are 62,000 Moslems and a non-Moslem population of only 2,000. Bulaq quarter has 82,000, a city in itself, with a total non-Moslem population of only 7,800. The Gemalieh quarter has 50,000 Moslems compared with 2,000 non-Moslems; and the Khalifa quarter has 53,000 Moslems and 1,340 non-Moslems. Saida Zeinab quarter has over 63,000 Moslems and a non-Moslem population of only 2,300. The Moslem population of Gizah Mudiriah, close to Cairo, is 11,900, while the number of non-Moslems is less than 4,000. The total population of this great world capital is nearly 900,000, of whom 90 per cent. are Mohammedan.

Bishop Brent, whose splendid work among the Moros in the Philippine Islands is well known, uses words concerning the Moslems there (who are at the antipodes of the Egyptian in culture and learning) that nevertheless apply also to Egypt:

Neither the Christian faith nor Christian civilization have more than dented the haughty unity of Islam. This does not mean that the problem is insoluble. It does indicate that the sincerity and power, the loyalty to tradition and principle, of the Moslem world thus far has been superior to that of Christendom, or at any rate impervious to the methods of conversion employed.

So far as religion is concerned the Christian Church can never hope to make headway against Islam until or unless She presents a higher and stronger unity than the followers of the Prophet.

What the Oriental churches have not accomplished because of this lack of unity and witnessing power is beginning to be done, however, by two forces that are everywhere disintegrating the pride and prestige of Islam. The impact of Western civilization through commerce and political supremacy on the one hand, and the gradual penetration of the world of Islam by the educational, medical, and evangelistic effort of Protestant missions have dented this religion in Egypt.

The war has made Moslems feel very keenly that they are losing ground politically. It has thrown Christendom and Christ into their thoughts as never before. They are face to face with a new world situation which fills them with dread and also hope. One Moslem Sheikh said: "England is invincible." The effect of the war does not generally seem to weigh against Christianity. Warfare generally agrees with their type of mind and they admire a religion that has fight in it. Another effect of the war doubtless has been to decrease the pride, temper the feeling, and cool the ardor of pan-Islamism. For political reasons many of the lower classes are more friendly now for fear of offending the British. In some quarters, among the more thoughtful, there is the feeling that this war is preparatory to the last days and the return of Christ and the Mahdi. Some say He *is* the Mahdi. The educated classes among Moslems have stated that the war was due to a failure in following Christ's teaching; but this feeling is not general. That the temporal power of the Caliphate has failed and that a shock of disappointment has gone through the whole body of Islam, cannot be doubted.

Ethical reform has been the chief movement, therefore, in Egypt during the war that has found free expression in the Moslem press. The censorship made it impossible for those who were disloyal to vent their feelings in regard to political and military events. They, therefore, turned themselves to sharp criticism of popular superstition and illiteracy among the masses. The movement was started by the Chancellor of the Azhar University and had the assistance of the Ministry of the Interior. Proclamations were made against certain forms of saint worship, public processions, and, especially, immorality in connection with funerals, weddings, and other assemblies.

The Moslem paper called *The Express* remarked:

We must do away with the mischievous superstitions which have exposed the Moslem community in this country to mockery and derision by those non-Moslems who do not know the real morals and fine teachings of Islam. What is before us is to see that the new step is rightly and strictly followed. We suggest that the police authorities should help in promoting this movement in the interest of public morals, for it is principally intended to purify the country from these acts of folly which have done a great harm to the character of the people. The wiser members of the community have also to take part in fighting against bad habits and disgraceful conduct of women who parade in the streets at festivals. Among many other things which have to be prohibited is the dancing of Moslem women in the streets and in public places. Apropos it is advisable to prevent Moslem women and girls from appearing in theatres in male attire. It is the earnest duty of every member of this community to do his best for purifying the country from these germs of evil.

And *Al-Ahram* made the following comment:

The Ministry of Wakfs has sent three new sermons to mosque orators in Cairo and the provinces, specially written by the Chancellorship of the Azhar University for the purpose of fighting against superstitions and customs which do not conform with

the teachings of the Islamic *Sheria*. These sermons are to be delivered at the Friday mid-day prayers, on three Fridays. The following is one of them: "Ye creatures of Allah, fear Allah, and remember His words. Ye believers do not follow the footsteps of Satan, for he who follows in the steps of Satan brings disgrace and sin. Disgrace and sin only alienate human beings from the favor of the Lord. * * * Ye creatures of Allah, who grasp at the faith, is it according to the rules of the faith to have wailing women in your funerals? Is it allowed by the faith to let your womenfolk go out in immoderate toilette to markets, funerals, weddings and other social assemblies? Religion does not teach you to abandon the Kitab and Sunna and create new superstitions which had no existence in the time of the Prophets, or the first Caliphs. Not at all. Our faith forbids all this and it is a sin to stick to it. Ye creatures of Allah, no superstition indicates the lack of sense and lack of determination more than that superstition which causes the loss of money and exposition of honour—the "*Zar*" [exorcism of evil spirits by pagan ceremonies]. This worst of superstitions has been entertained by foolish and simple people so much that they think it to be derived from religion. In practicing this rotten superstition foolish women demonstrate foolish acts which are not in the least permitted by Islam. * * * Is it right that this community which adopts the faith of the Prophet should be so sadly misguided and err to this extent? Is it wise that men should yield to women's curiosity in this respect? Allah says in his Book, "Men are guardians of women." * * *

There is no doubt that in these social reforms, temperance, education, and all such "ideals of democracy" educated Moslems are our allies and not our enemies. They are as anxious as are the missionaries for the uplifting and enlightenment of the masses. Although their efforts are spasmodic, they are not unconscious of the need for this uplifting and enlightenment. Most of them are ardent admirers of much that they consider the best in Western civilization. But alas! too few of their number are ready to help others

reach the goal that they admire. Many are ardent reformers on the platform only.

Yet the present offers us an opportunity such as we have never had before for coöperation with these reformers on moral questions, like temperance, the rights of woman, the needs of childhood, popular education, etc. By such coöperation their hearts will be opened toward us, and the ministry of friendship will find new points of contact everywhere. Moslems are most ready to join with us in meetings of this character. The addresses recently given by Tewfiq Effendi Diab at the American Mission and in the theaters of Cairo show how such topics draw the crowds.

Although Islam has a new ethical program and their new ideals are based on the Sermon on the Mount rather than the *suras* given at Mecca, the opposition to the cardinal teachings of Christianity is still evident nearly everywhere. But the line of battle has changed within the last decade in a most remarkable way, and this is largely due to the widespread circulation of the Scriptures and increasing knowledge among many Moslems of their contents.

Formerly the arena of the conflict was the Koran and tradition; now it is the Bible. Moslems are trying everywhere to prove from our Scriptures the incorrectness of our teaching, and are trying to read Moslem truths into the Christian Gospel. This is evident, not only in the line of public and private discussion, but most of all in the tone of the Moslem press. Since the war it has become impossible to consult the Moslem daily and weekly papers, for most of them in India and practically all of them in Egypt have ceased publication. Those that remain are so carefully censored or edited that one cannot learn the real feelings and opinions

that prevail. Before the war, the old Islamic press, true to Koran teaching and the place always given to Jesus among the greater prophets, confessed Christ with its lips, though its heart was far from accepting His message. Yet it did not attack the character of Jesus as do some of the Moslems of the new school. On the other hand, it exceeded them in violent opposition to Christian missions.

Esh-Sha'ab, once one of the leading papers, on March 1, 1914, had an editorial on the deceitful dealings of missionaries, who, by mission boats on the Nile, hospitals, and schools, laid traps for the unwary. The same paper, June 23, 1914, published a full page article attacking Beirut College and characterizing its Bible teaching as subversive of Islam: "O fathers who have hearkened to the voice of the ignorant, why have you plunged your precious children into this fire of hell where devils are their guardians?"

The old Islam refuses compromise with Christianity and fully understands that the gulf in theological teaching cannot be bridged. Their attitude toward Christ is respectful, but toward Christianity, especially among those who hope that Islam will yet be victorious everywhere, it is that of defiance and opposition. Although the political situation holds in check Moslem fanaticism and prevents freedom of speech through the censorship of the press, we must not be deceived by the outward calm. When circumstances are favorable and hearts are inflamed with passion, the Moslems of the old school, both Shiah and Sunni, have shown by their *jihads* and massacres of Christians—their neighbors and outwardly their friends—what their real feeling is. The story of the Armenian massacres is evidence that cannot be gainsaid, and what took place at Urumia and

Salmas and Van might have happened in Cairo or Calcutta at the outbreak of the European war had it not been for the strong hand of the British government.

Nevertheless, the general opinion seems to be that at present there is a greater willingness to converse along religious lines and that the corruption of the Gospels and the stumbling-block of the Incarnation and the Atonement are less referred to than formerly. One missionary writes that objection is taken more often to our methods than to our message. They say: "You ingratiate Christianity by cheap schools, hospitals, and cheap literature." The result is that they emulate our methods on these lines, sometimes with remarkable success. The common people everywhere gladly listen to the Gospel story. They come in crowds to the meetings held by Mr. Fairman, Mr. Reed, and other missionary evangelists. Their attendance at Christian services is altogether more frequent than it was some years ago. A worker in Kaliub remarks that former opposition to the preaching of Christ crucified is now changed to silence and discomfiture which are full of promise. There is increasing interest in a comparison of the cardinal points that distinguish the two religions; this increasing friendliness in the villages of the Delta is due, we are told, to their appreciation of missionary character and the Christian ministry of kindness.

There is a tendency among Moslems to combat our position by verses from the Gospel itself, *e.g.*, a muezzin of Mehallat Damana tried to prove that Christ was sent only to the Jews, from Christ's own reply to the Syro-Phoenician woman: "I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," insisting that "Go ye into all the world," in the light of the former passage, could only mean the scattered world of

the Jewish tribes or peoples. The attitude, however, is that of an outsider viewing a contest and not that of a contestant anxious to win the battle. From every part of the field we hear of a remarkable readiness to read the Scriptures, which is most encouraging and is a clear evidence that God's Spirit is working among them. Mr. Hooper reports on behalf of the Bible Society:

In our work we experience an increasing demand for Scriptures, especially by Moslems, together with an evident and increasing spirit of enquiry as compared with bygone days. Students of the Koran purchase the Bible freely, and are reading it. Only occasionally do we meet with hostile opposition to the book when presented. Sales to Moslems are steadily increasing in the Delta towns and villages.

From Menuf and other places we learn that Moslems understand the teachings of the Gospel better than formerly, and many of them acknowledge that Christ died and that the Scriptures are true. There are many Nicodemuses. An old Moslem said: "Buy the Christian Book; it brings a blessing to the house: a house without it will go to ruin. My father said so."

From Zagazig a missionary writes:

The older type of men often evince a liberal spirit of enquiry, but even then it is hard for them to get away from the attitude of, "to you, your religion; to me, mine." If a man thinks he can convert Egypt with comparative religions, he might as well not bother about getting a passport out here; for the people will deliberately meet you half way and compare with you all day. I was interested in the attitude of a bookseller here, who said, "We must get away from the trash and rubbish that has accumulated in our religion, and preach a live message like the Protestants." When such ideas once get started who can tell where they may stop.

Not to speak of the Coptic Church, which is showing evident signs of revival and is yielding to an intellectual

awakening, the native Evangelical Church, with its nearly 13,000 members and representing a community of 33,000 souls, is undoubtedly a religious dynamic in the midst of the vast Moslem population.

Since living in Egypt I have tried to study some of the reasons why the Copts as a whole, and even the Evangelical Copts, are not more deeply interested and active in carrying the Gospel to their Mohammedan neighbors. The native Christians of Egypt, like Oriental Christians generally, are still in fear of Moslems and of Islam as a social-political system. Centuries of oppression have made them feel that they are a subject race, that Islam is dominant, and instead of moral courage and the spirit of martyrdom one sees too often a shrinking and a cowardice that is pathetic. Some converts have proved disappointing, and the question is still raised in certain quarters whether the Gospel is really the power of God unto salvation for the Moslems also. Hope deferred has made the heart sick, and instead of a calm confidence in victory there is, on the part of many, despair and pessimism; the effect of Turkey's collapse, however, has awakened a new hope.

In addition to these hindrances we must mention the ignorance of Islam and of the Moslem problem and lack of sympathy for that which is best in Mohammedanism. It has been a great joy to teach Al Ghazali's *Ihya* to the classes in our theological seminary and to note the evident surprise on the part of otherwise well-read and educated pupils at the high moral teachings and the spiritual views of this great mystic. We need in Egypt a new leadership in the native church, men who have thoroughly studied Islam at its best, who know its literature, and who have faith in God that He will use His church to win the Moslem world. Christian ignor-

ance of Islam and lack of faith as regards the Moslem problem was the chief hindrance in America and Europe only a few decades ago. It has been removed through education. This new leadership is already in the making. A laymen's missionary movement has been organized; the Sunday School has its missionary program; the missionaries themselves are more and more turning their chief attention to evangelizing Moslems.

Throughout all the period of the war the regular work of the various missions has continued not only unhindered but with increasing efficiency. As the Arabic proverb puts it: "The oak of the forest is felled by an axe whose handle is taken from it," the Egyptian church will come to its own and redeem its past by work for Moslems, and gain the victory. There have been outstanding examples of Moslem converts who have proved very apostles to their people. Their number is increasing. This is the time of times, a God-given opportunity, a decisive hour. We may see the dawn of the day of triumph.

The world war has destroyed Islam as a political power; the questions of *Dar-ul-harb* and *Dar-ul-Islam* are no longer practical. Islam now stands before the world stripped of every support save such intellectual, moral, and spiritual claims as it can press home. Apostates are no longer punishable by death. We, too, must therefore press the issue on intellectual and moral lines and compel decision. What will they do with Jesus, now that the war is over?

Although Islam has been shaken to its very foundations, Moslems have not been able to express publicly all they feel. On my way to China I had a long talk with Sir James Meston, then Lieutenant-governor of the United Provinces, regarding the situation in India

and the present feeling of Moslems. He expressed the opinion that it was the hardest time the Moslems had ever had. The war is to them a great trial of faith, and, although the majority are loyal, they feel that the bottom has dropped out. The whole of the Hejaz campaign and the new Arabian Kingdom was to many of them a disappointment. They know it succeeded only because its "spontaneous" character was reinforced by allies who are not Moslem. Their hopes for Islam have failed. Never was the opportunity greater for the manifestation of sympathy, for the outpouring of sacrificial friendship, and for persevering prayer. The Moslem world has been shaken from center to circumference. The fire, the earthquake, the tornado, have done their work. In the words of Dr. John R. Mott: "We are called by this shaken world, by this overburdened world, by this teachable world, to prepare for vast reconstructive tasks." The main one of which is to preach the Gospel.

NEW YORK.

THE GERMAN HIGHER LIFE MOVEMENT IN ITS CHIEF EXPONENT

By PROFESSOR BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, D.D., LL.D., Litt. D.

I.

IT was a very remarkable campaign which was conducted by Robert Pearsall Smith in Great Britain and Germany during the years 1873-1875 in the interests of what is known as "the higher Christian life." It has left behind it two imposing monuments. One of them, the great "Keswick Movement," is known wherever the English language is spoken. The other, a parallel movement in Germany, spoken of there as *Die Heiligungsbewegung*, the "Sanctification Movement," deserves to be better known than it appears to be. It took a peculiar form, which was given it by the circumstance that it made its way primarily in, and always by means of, "the Fellowships" (*Gemeinschaften*) which had come down from the times of Pietistic ascendancy, and were now given new life and set upon a career of rapid self-propagation, by the impulse received from Pearsall Smith. Thus the "Sanctification Movement" inaugurated by him became in its form a great "Fellowship Movement," which has spread throughout Germany and has extended itself everywhere in a stable organization and numerous instruments of activity. The center of its public manifestation is the great Gnadau Conference.

One of the remarkable features of this "Sanctification Movement" has been that it took its color very largely from the teachings of one man. This man was Theodor Jellinghaus, who received his Higher Life doctrine from Smith and his colleagues at the great Oxford Union Meeting for the Promoting of Scriptural Holi-

ness, in the early days of September, 1874, and who returned thence to Germany having before him his life work of propagating it. In 1880 he published the work which became very much the doctrinal text-book of the movement, under the title of *The Complete Present Salvation through Christ*.¹ Through this book, in its successive editions, and the Bible school which he founded for the training of workers for the movement, Jellinghaus was able to give to the movement its doctrinal character. This doctrinal character, while following in the main, and at first very closely, the teachings of Smith, did not exactly coincide with them in all its details, and departed more and more from them as time went on, though never fundamentally. This was clearly marked in the successive editions of the book. A particular quality of its own was thus acquired by the German Sanctification Movement, which differentiated it as a distinct species of Higher Life teaching, while it retained its generic character.

Its development on these lines proceeded with great and fruitful quietness throughout the last quarter of the nineteenth century. With the twentieth century, however, a period of turmoil set in. Fanatical tendencies showed themselves, with ever increasing violence. A consequent perfectionism endeavored to substitute itself for the moderate perfectionism of the Higher Life teachers, and especially of Jellinghaus, the most discreet of them all. The excesses of the Welsh Revival were imported into Germany. Worst of all, the Fellowship circles were invaded by the fanaticisms of the "Pentecost Movement"—the "Los Angeles Revival," which brought ruin in their train. The ultimate result was an immense

¹ *Das völlige, gegenwärtige Heil durch Christum*, 1880, 1886, 1890, 1898, 1903.

revulsion of feeling. The whole Higher Life system which had supported the doctrinal basis of the movement from its beginning was undermined and discredited. Jellinghaus himself, who had given his life to its propagation, published, in a remarkable book, his recantation of it.² When the Great War lowered its curtain over the land and shut off observation of the course of religious events in it, it looked very much as if the Fellowship Movement had definitely ceased to be a Higher Life movement and had returned with happy decisiveness to the Reformation for its doctrinal basis.

Inclined as we thus are to look upon the Fellowship Movement as a thing of the past so far as it was distinctively a "sanctification movement," that is to say, so far as it was a continuation of the Higher Life Movement conveyed to Europe in 1873-5 by Robert Pearsall Smith, it becomes desirable as a matter of history that we should make an attempt to understand the precise character of its teaching as a "sanctification movement." It has already been pointed out that this is practically the same thing as to undertake an exposition of the Higher Life teaching of Theodor Jellinghaus.³ He wrote a number of books;⁴ but it is particularly his massive volume on *The Complete Present Salvation through Christ* which claims our attention here. We have already intimated that it advances a little from edi-

² *Erklärungen über meine Lehrirrungen*, 1912.

³ Of course it is very possible to avoid the appearance of this, as Hermann Benser does in his *Das moderne Gemeinschaftschristentum*, 1910, p. 24 ff., as also in his article on the same subject in Schiele und Zscharnack, *Die Religion*, u. s. w., vol. II, col. 1267 f., by writing ostensibly on the Piety of Fellowship Christianity. It comes, however, to the same thing in the end. Cf. Th. Hardeland's admirable exposition in the *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, IX, 1898, p. 42 ff.

⁴ *Das völlige, gegenwärtige Heil durch Christum* (1880) 1903; *Der Römerbrief*, 1903; *Die I. Joh. Epistel*, 1899; *Sieg und Leben*, 1906; *Leben aus Gott*; *Erklärungen über meine Lehrirrungen*, 1912. He edited also from 1899 *Mitteilungen aus der Bibelschule*.

tion to edition in its departure from Pearsall Smith's teachings. It will not be necessary for us, however, to trace this advance in detail. It is not Jellinghaus' personal growth that we are interested in; we are seeking merely to obtain through him a clear conception of the type of Higher Life teaching prevalent in the Fellowship Movement in Germany for the forty years from 1875 to 1914. We shall, then, merely take the fourth edition of Jellinghaus' work, published in 1898—about the middle point of our period—and observe by means of it how the matter was presented to the Fellowships near the end of the quiet development of the movement, and before the turmoil of the twentieth century set in. This is the way the adherents of the movement were being taught to think at the period of its most uninterrupted development. This is the way, in other words, in which the Fellowships connected with the Gnadau Conference have been accustomed to conceive their distinctive doctrine of full salvation through faith alone.⁵

Jellinghaus himself⁶ was, in the deepest stratum of his thinking, a good Lutheran. The characteristic Lutheran doctrine of the Word, as the vehicle of the saving operations of God, remained to the end the de-

⁵ Valuable expositions and criticisms of Jellinghaus' theology will be found in: Th. Hardeland, *Die Evangelization mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Heiligungsbewegung* in the *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1898, IX, p. 53 ff; L. Clasen, *Heiligung im Glauben; mit Rücksicht auf die heutige Heiligungsbewegung*, in the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1900, X, p. 457 ff; and P. Gennrich, *Wiedergeburt und Heiligung mit Bezug auf die gegenwärtigen Strömungen des religiösen Lebens*, 1908. The former two use the second, the last the fifth edition of Jellinghaus' book. Cf. also Ernst Rietschel, *Lutherische Rechtfertigungslehre oder moderne Heiligungslehre?* 1909; and Paul Fleisch's series of books on the *Gemeinschaftsbewegung*.

⁶ Born at Schlüssenburg near Minden in 'Württemberg; became missionary in India in 1865; pastor at Radnitz near Grossen on the Oder in 1873; pastor at Gütergotz, near Potsdam, in 1881; made Emeritus in 1898. He founded in 1885 the first Bible school of the Fellowship Movement and trained in it many workers; he also published, from 1899 on, *Mitteilungen aus der Bibelschule*.

termining element of his conception of salvation.⁷ Under cover of it, he was able to teach a Pelagianizing doctrine of salvation; because, in his view, the supernatural operation conveyed in the Word brings to men only the possibility (*posse*), not also the actualization (*actio*), of that surrendering faith on which everything else is suspended. That is to say, what he teaches is that everyone who hears the Word finds himself in the exact condition in which, according to Pelagius, all are by nature; he has the *posse* for doing all that God requires of him, and the *actio* is his own responsibility.

With respect to the great doctrine of redemption his original Lutheranism had, however, early given way under the disintegrating influences of his times. Already in his student days at Erlangen the teaching of C. F. K. von Hofmann had taken from him the central doctrine of the penal satisfaction of Christ, without, however, conveying to him anything positive in its stead. His positive doctrine of redemption, acquired under influences emanating ultimately from J. A. W. Neander, followed the lines of the ordinary "mystical" doctrine characteristic of the so-called "mediating theology."⁸ According to this doctrine it is not the merits of Christ which we receive through faith, but Christ Himself; and, receiving Christ Himself, we share, in organic union with Him, all His achievements. As the last Adam, the new organic Head of the race, He presents Himself a pure sacrifice

⁷ For example, p. 144: "The same word concerning Christ that brings Christ to our hearts, works also the power to faith in us through the Holy Spirit who dwells in it, so that everyone who *will* can believe in Christ"—that is, every hearer of the Gospel who will, not everyone absolutely.

⁸ Those who wish to see this doctrine expressed in a form indistinguishable from Jellinghaus' may profitably read the essay on The Work of Jesus Christ, in F. Godet's Biblical Studies in the New Testament, E. T., pp. 148-200, to which Jellinghaus elsewhere makes admiring allusions. It was published in 1873, nearly a year before the Oxford Meeting of 1874.

to God,⁹ dying to sin and living to righteousness; and we who are in Him by faith die with Him to sin and live with Him to righteousness. It is possible so to attenuate this doctrine as to reduce its contents to nothing more than that, under the impression received from the religious life of Christ, we too live religiously, entering thus sympathetically into inner fellowship with Him in His death and His resurrection. Then we have Ritschlianism; and Gelshorn, for example, seems half inclined to claim Jellinghaus as, for substance of doctrine, of this party.¹⁰ That, however, although not without a show of plausibility, is to do him an injustice. It is quite clear that Jellinghaus thinks of Christ not merely as, by the movingness of His example, inducing men to imitate Him, but as releasing supernatural forces by which alone they can be assimilated to Him.

By this doctrine of redemption, it is plain, on the other hand, that a wide door was opened for the entrance of Pearsall Smith's teaching of sanctification by faith alone. It would be more exact, indeed, to say that this was already implicitly Jellinghaus' own doctrine. It only required to be explicitly stated, therefore, to command his assent. There were elements in Pearsall Smith's teaching, no doubt, which should have given him pause; and it is instructive to observe that, though these elements were received at first with the rest, it was precisely they to which he sat loosely and which he gradually eliminated from his teaching—thus no doubt loosening the hold

⁹ Jellinghaus' doctrine of sacrifice belongs to the class of "symbolical" theories, grounded on the hypothesis of Baer. There is no "juristically substitutive, bloody penal death"; the significance of the rite lies not in the idea of "expiation," but in that of "drawing near." The chief matters are the "altar" and the "blood," the symbols respectively of the presence of God and the life of the offerer. The offerer approaches God, but being himself impure, comes into His presence through a substituted pure life. This is somehow supposed, by an organic union with the victim, to purify him.

¹⁰ *Die Christliche Welt*, 1905, Vol. XIX, No. 38, col. 890 ff.

upon him of the whole of which they were organic parts and preparing the way for his final discarding of the entire system. We may instance, as a striking example, the doctrine, fundamental to Pearsall Smith's system, as to Wesley's before him, that justification and sanctification are two separable gifts of grace to be sought and obtained separately, and standing in no other relation to one another than that the former must precede the latter. Such a conception was utterly incongruous to Jellinghaus' doctrine of redemption by organic union with Christ, instituted by a faith which receives Himself with all that that implies. It was accepted by him accordingly only to be gradually explained away, until in the end there was nothing left of it but a few encysted phrases bearing witness to a transcended phase of teaching.

From another point of view Jellinghaus was prepared to accord a welcome to the teaching of Pearsall Smith by his ten years of missionary experience in India. By it he was deeply imbued with the spirit of evangelization. The duty and profit of offering Jesus Christ to the sinner for immediate acceptance could not be doubtful to him. Nor could it be doubtful to him that this immediate acceptance of Christ brought with it enjoyment of all that is included in Christ's redemption. It is not strange that, with his doctrine of redemption, he was ready to understand this as the immediate enjoyment in its completeness of all that is included in Christ's redemption. The element of "suddenness" in Smith's doctrine was no offense to him; it rather was an attraction and fell in with his own implicit thought.

We are only surprised therefore that he tells¹¹ us that when "in the holiness-meetings at Oxford in September,

¹¹ *Das völlige, gegenwärtige Heil durch Christum*, p. 20.

1874, there met him, in luminous clearness, out of the Bible, the truth that in the blood and death of Jesus not only forgiveness but also *direct and immediate* [the emphasis is his own] breaking of the power of sin, cleansing from sin, and uninterrupted victory over sin, are to be had on the surrender of faith," it was a "new truth" to him. What ought to have been new to him—and what ought not to have seemed true to him even temporarily—was the representation that these two blessings were not obtained together through "the surrender of faith," but successively by two surrenders of faith. It happens not rarely, however, that men hold to their fundamental conceptions through long periods without developing them into their implications; and, when these implications are presented to them from without, embrace them with an enthusiasm which is born not more of the convincingness of their presentation than of their reinforcement from the logical relation in which they stand to their own immanent thought. And it not rarely happens in such cases that the enthusiasm with which these conceptions are embraced, when externally presented to it, carries the mind over difficulties in the mode of their presentations, and betrays it into accepting them in forms not really in harmony with its immanent thought and incapable therefore of permanent entertainment by it.

That at any rate is what happened to Jellinghaus at Oxford. He heard asserted there in the most impressive way that we receive through faith in Jesus Christ with the same directness and immediacy as deliverance from the guilt of our sins, also deliverance from their power. He could not resist this assertion; it was a necessary implicate of his own fundamental conception of redemption. In his enthusiastic acceptance of it, he took the assertion, naturally, as it was made to him; and it was

made to him in a form which implied not only a notion of the relation of sanctification to justification, but a view of the nature of justification itself which was out of harmony with his fundamental conception of redemption and which therefore could not be permanently held by him.

In his enthusiasm he went out and preached his new doctrine of sanctification as he had received it. That is to say, he preached a doctrine of justification and a doctrine of the relation of sanctification to justification, which, in conjunction with his fundamental doctrine of redemption, he could not really believe. This could not last. The inevitable adjustments soon began to set in. If we understand him correctly, he attributes the process of these adjustments to the period between 1883 and 1890, so that they received their record in the second (1886) and especially in the third (1890) and subsequent editions of his book, *Das völlige, gegenwärtige Heil*. He conceived himself in this process to be writing in beneath his new-found doctrine of sanctification an appropriate doctrine of redemption. He says:

During the years 1883-1890 it became to me ever more certain that if we have to teach according to the Scriptures that the power of sin has been broken in the death of Christ, and life and the forces of sanctification have been obtained for the believer in the resurrection of Christ, then we have to conceive Christ's atonement and redemption also as a deliverance from the guilt *and* power of sin, and as a restoration of eternal life, righteousness, sanctification and love through His resurrection. Not the doctrine of sanctification only, therefore, but also the doctrine of atonement and redemption through Christ's blood and of justification and regeneration, are in need of a Biblical purification and renovation (p. 21).

He misconceived, however, the direction of the process. What he was really doing was adjusting his new-found doctrine of sanctification to his fundamental conception of redemption. It was the latter, not the

former, which really possessed his mind and formed the fixed point in the adjustments that were going on. What he really gives us in the later editions of his book is, therefore, the Higher Life doctrine launched by W. E. Boardman and the Smiths as modified to fit the requirements of the "mediating theology"—this Higher Life doctrine in the form which it takes when preached on the basis of the "mediating theology." That is the real significance of Jellinghaus, and, under his guidance, of the German *Heiligungsbewegung* during the forty years from 1874 to 1914.

This being so, it cannot be thought in the least strange that Jellinghaus devotes a large part of his volume—at least half of it—to the vindication of the fundamental soteriological postulate of the "mediating theology," that, as we enter by faith into vital union with Christ as the last Adam, the new organic Head of humanity, we become through this faith alone sharer in all that He has wrought, in His death and resurrection, as our complete Deliverer.¹² He entitles this half of his book *Justification through Christ Alone*, to match the title which he gives the second half, *Sanctification through Christ Alone*. But this designation will be misleading to all who do not share his conception of the *ordo salutis*, based on the "mystical" idea of the nature of salvation prevalent in the "mediating theology." In this *ordo salutis* there is no place for the "justification" of the theology of the Reformation; "justification," too, becomes a purely subjective experience—the experience of forgiveness of sins as a result of vital union with the Christ who has transcended sin. It is only artificially separated, therefore, from sanctifica-

¹² The terms *erlösen*, *Erlösung*, *Erlöser*, have, in Jellinghaus, no connotation of "redemption" in the proper sense of that term—as indeed *Lösegeld* itself has no connotation of "ransoming." They are all confined strictly by him to the general idea of "deliverance."

tion; the two are in fact only parts of the same general experience, the experience of "participation in the Christ-life."

The two parts of Jellinghaus' book do not, therefore, in fact treat of what is commonly known as Justification and of Sanctification, or—to put it in language less open perhaps, in this atmosphere, to misapprehension—of deliverance from the guilt and deliverance from the power of sin. They treat of the experience of deliverance which the Christian has through faith in Christ, viewed, we might say, now from the point of sight of its inception, now from the point of sight of its completion, though that would be to speak far too strongly in terms of chronological sequence. Perhaps we would better say, viewed now from the point of sight of its general content, now from the point of sight of the completeness of the deliverance—in one of its aspects, singled out for special remark. What Jellinghaus actually attempts to do in the two parts of his book is to show, in the first part, that we receive by faith in Christ a complete deliverance, and, in the second part, that this complete deliverance includes in itself an immediately complete deliverance from the power of sin. The first part would have been more descriptively designated, therefore, had the title which its first chapter bears been given to it—The Complete Deliverer, or more explicitly, Complete Deliverance through Faith Alone. And the second part would have been more descriptively designated by some such title as this, Sanctification by Faith Alone an Immediately Complete Sanctification.

What Jellinghaus has undertaken in the first part of his book he has accomplished with complete success. He has triumphantly shown from the Scriptures that there is complete deliverance in Christ Jesus for all who look

to Him for it in simple faith. That is the teaching of Scripture, and Jellinghaus brings it out with great fullness, energy, and convincingness. Of course, he writes from his own point of view, and adjusts the Scriptural proofs which he adduces, to meet particular ends as they emerge in the progress of his argument. It is his primary purpose, for example, to show, that in the complete deliverance which we receive by faith in Christ Jesus there is included deliverance from the power of sin as well as from its guilt. He is possessed by the odd notion that in the church doctrine of the penal satisfaction of Christ provision is made only for deliverance from guilt—justification in the Reformation sense, as he would conceive it—while the whole process of sanctification is left to be worked out by man himself under the impulse of gratitude for the forgiveness of his sins. He is zealous therefore to prove on the one hand that sanctification is a supernatural work, and on the other that it is inseparably connected with justification and is always present where justification is present. He frequently adduces the Scriptural proof of the completeness of this deliverance which we receive in Christ by faith, accordingly, with sharp application to such points as these, and always with particular emphasis on deliverance from the power of sin, and, naturally, in terms of the “mediating theology.”

This in no way affects the force of that proof for the main matter. But it brings with it some very interesting results with respect to the maintenance of his own special contentions. To illustrate by a single instance, he succeeds so perfectly in proving that sanctification and justification are inseparable—that in being justified by faith we obtain also sanctification—as to leave no room for the acquisition of sanctification by a second act of faith

specifically directed to that end; and thus reduces himself to the necessity of distinguishing, not between justification and sanctification as separable benefits received by separate acts of faith, but between a first sanctification coming with justification and a second and complete sanctification obtained subsequently by a detached act of faith of its own—with the further effect of making complete sanctification not an “all at once” acquisition on simple faith, but a progressive attainment received in stages. This is the more pungent that, from his point of view as a “mediating theologian,” he is compelled to look upon sanctification, not as the necessary consequence of justification as in the Reformation doctrine, nor merely as the inseparable accompaniment of justification, but as identical with justification. If, when we enter into Christ by faith as the last Adam, the Head of which we are but members, we receive Him Himself, all of Him, all that He has and is, what remains to be obtained by a second act of faith as a “second blessing”?

Let us observe how Jellinghaus actually expresses himself on this fundamental matter:¹³

The Gospel becomes most simple and most intelligible when we, along with the Bible, present the whole saving-work of Christ as a deliverance, rescue, salvation for man held in sin and misery, and offer it to the simple acceptance of faith (p. 52).

It is a wholly one-sided quarter-gospel, when it is taught that Christ's sacrificial work accomplished no more than that He blotted out guilt and earned an imputable merit, but says nothing of this—that in Jesus' blood there are present and available for believers, hungry for righteousness and holiness, death-forces delivering from all evils, and resurrection-forces bringing all fruits of the Spirit that belong to the kingdom of heaven (p. 40).

The believer seeks in Christ not only forgiveness of the guilt of sin, but also deliverance from its power and cleansing of the heart (p. 258).

What stands there [he is commenting on Romans 6:3-5] is not at all that this baptism signifies only a duty of dying daily; but

¹³ Unless otherwise indicated, the quotations, given with page numbers only, are from the fourth edition of *Das völlige, gegenwärtige Heil durch Christum*.

what it says is that all true believers are already baptized into Jesus' death and are buried with Jesus according to the old man in this death, and therefore are free from the power of sin and uncleanness (p. 311).

The Scriptures teach that forgiveness of sins, justification, the new life, cleansing and victory come of faith (p. 259).

Through this faith in Christ, Christ, and His righteousness, sanctification and life, which are external to us, comes into us, and becomes our possession. Yes, as soon as the man entrusts himself to Christ in faith, the Holy Spirit comes, in justification, into our heart and abides in our heart in order to testify that God, for Christ's sake, has forgiven our sins, and in order to glorify Christ in our heart, with His sanctifying death- and resurrection-power. Therefore together with justification there come also regeneration, cleansing, renovation, vivification, transference into the kingdom of heaven, the possession of eternal life (cf. 1 Cor. vi. 12, "But ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified") (p. 263).

For forgiveness of sins, justification, vivification, and salvation fall at once together with faith (p. 264).

Regeneration, the new life, cleansing of heart and walk, and sanctification hang together [with justification] inwardly and inseparably (as Luther teaches clearly) (p. 265 f.).

There exists therefore no justification and forgiveness of sins in Christ through faith without eternal life and regeneration in Christ; as Luther also says that where forgiveness of sins is there also is life and blessedness. He who really receives forgiveness and justification in the blood, that is, in the death of the dead and risen Lord—he is also through the blood of Christ cleansed from sins and lives in Christ's life (Gal. II. 16-21. Rom. X. 1-11, John III. 14-16) (p. 255).

If we look at our deliverance thus, it becomes clear to us that John can always speak of eternal life as the immediate result of faith in Christ, and it is also manifest how, to be justified, converted, regenerated, resurrected and sanctified hang inwardly together according to the New Testament—yes, are one and the same thing (p. 43).

It is impossible therefore that there should be faith without works: "Faith and trust are inwardly connected with faithfulness and obedience." He says expressly:

There exists no Christian faith and trust without Christian faithfulness and obedience. So soon as I believe in Christ, I have come also to rueful apprehension of my disobedience theretofore. I trust in the Savior who was obedient up to death, that He will and can deliver me from the curse of the disobeyed commandment and from the slavery of sin, that is from disobedience. I

believe, therefore, unto obedience. Everyone who believes in Christ, his Deliverer, yields himself to Christ, in order to die with Christ unto himself and his corrupt wilfulness, and to live in Jesus Christ and in obedient imitation of Him. Through the faith that is wrought by the Holy Spirit it always comes to obedience. * * * There is no faith in Christ which does not work an innermost fact and transformation, because it draws from the sanctifying life-powers of Jesus (p. 153).

Jellinghaus undoubtedly intends that statements like these should be read as teaching that sanctification is by faith. So far are they, however, from teaching that sanctification comes from a special act of faith directed to the obtaining of it and it alone, that they rather explicitly connect sanctification with the fundamental act of faith by which we receive the forgiveness of our sins. He cannot leave the matter at that. We find him therefore very much preoccupied with the exact relation of faith to sanctification. In his discussions of this subject he sometimes speaks quite on the lines of the passages we have already quoted, and is intent only on making the supernaturalness of salvation clear. Approaching the matter from the standpoint of the "mediating theology" he often insists in this interest that sanctification is something which has been obtained for us by Christ, just like justification, objectively; which exists therefore objectively in Christ for us, and which is only to be taken over from Himself, as it were, as a whole. He objects therefore to distinguishing between justification and sanctification in such terms as "Christ for us" and "Christ in us"; it is just as proper to speak of "Christ for us" in connection with sanctification as in connection with justification, and of "Christ in us" in connection with justification as in connection with sanctification. He says:

Where the Bible speaks of sanctification through faith it means that Christ Himself has wrought out for us our deliverance from the power of sin, and He Himself is continuously the mighty Deliverer and victorious Leader of believers. It is therefore a

misleading representation of the doctrine of justification and sanctification when it is said with sharp distinction that "Christ for us" is the justification and "Christ in us" the sanctification of the Christian. "Christ for us" is the sinner's justification and forgiveness through faith; but in the moment in which the man, in the power of the Holy Spirit, trustingly surrenders himself to Christ as the Deliverer from sins, Christ becomes his possession and the life of Christ comes into his heart, so that he is not only justified but also regenerated and sanctified in Christ, so that therefore he is in Christ and Christ is in him. Precisely so is "Christ for us," that is, what Christ has obtained for us by victory over the power of sin, death and the devil, or the living, risen Jesus and His holy blood, the sole foundation and power of our sanctification, on which we have to trust. Only because the Christian who thirsts after sanctification has outside himself, in Christ,—the mighty Deliverer, present in the Word, who can continually wash and cleanse by His blood,—a sanctifying power and a fulcrum which stands immovable, can he be confident in the midst of his changing feelings and sure of victory. Because he thus through the Holy Spirit surrenders himself in believing obedience to this full, present Deliverer and all His sanctifying powers, Christ Himself comes into his heart, and, as "Christ in us," becomes the heart's innermost life * * * (p. 540).

He objects much more strenuously, however, in the same interest of the supernaturalness of salvation, to every mode of representation that would see in the faith which procures it the ground or the substance of sanctification. If sanctification is to be by works, it would be better to say so frankly, than to say "by faith" (*im Glauben*) with the meaning that faith is the one work which obtains it.

Because the truth—that Christ has already wrought out and made possible for us also our deliverance from the power of sin and our sanctification, and offers it now *in Himself*, as the full, present Deliverer—has been very little understood hitherto, great obscurity and uncertainty has reigned also with respect to the doctrine of sanctification by faith. Many teachers and textbooks, which teach with complete decision the forgiveness of sins through naked, simple faith alone, speak of sanctification as of a state which is gradually brought about by the virtue of our faith and our love and gratitude. Whereas, after the example of Luther, they repudiate with all decision, that faith as a sanctifying disposition [*Gesinnung*] justifies and discharges from the guilt of sin or even only makes us worthy to be received by Christ—

they (as for example Thomasius) say without hesitation that after justification faith becomes our fundamental disposition [*Grundgesinnung*] and thus sanctifies. The Evangelical dogmatists speak with reference to sanctification not only of a *vis receptiva* (receptive power) but also of a *vis operativa* (self-effective power) of faith. Such a self-effective power, however, is not possessed by faith, whether in justification or in sanctification; all of its power comes from its object, that is, from Christ (p. 538).¹⁴

In this statement justifying and sanctifying faith are, no doubt, distinguished, but they are not separated. Jellinghaus' real position in this matter is made somewhat clearer by a passage which occurs on page 545. He is there speaking of the one-sidedness of the Reformation doctrine, with its stress on justification by faith alone and its neglect of the twin truth as to sanctification. He adduces in illustration a form of statement which he represents as very widespread among both Lutheran and Reformed theologians, to the effect that "justification daily repeated is sanctification." This form of statement certainly is objectionable. Justification is not, no matter how often repeated, sanctification, for the very good reason that justification directly affects only our standing while sanctification directly affects our state. In the course of the discussion, however, Jellinghaus substitutes for it the form of statement, "Justifying faith sanctifies," which he appears to treat as its equivalent, though it very certainly is not that.

The point of interest for the moment is that in criticizing this latter statement, Jellinghaus declares it to be ambiguous. It may mean, he says, this: "Justifying faith is so excellent a quality and mental attribute in a man that it sanctifies the man." He rightly says that in that sense it would be intolerable. It may also, however, happily mean this: "The same faith which lays hold of Christ for justification, lays hold of Him and

¹⁴ Cf. the parallel statement, p. 376 f., note.

experiences Him also for sanctification." In that sense, says Jellinghaus, it is "unconditionally correct"; and that he means this in the sense, not that the same kind of faith, but that the same exercise of faith, both justifies and sanctifies, he makes plain by a qualification which he at once introduces. This is to this effect: "Only, it should not be understood by it, that faith lays hold of Jesus equally along with justification in full measure for actual sanctification." Sanctification is obtained in the same act of faith by which justification is received—but not all the sanctification which is to be obtained. After this first sanctification there is a further sanctification accessible to us by a faith which is a purely sanctifying faith—a further sanctification which is in full measure.

Meanwhile the existence of any such thing as a purely sanctifying faith—and indeed the validity of the whole representation that sanctification, whether along with justification or alone, is received immediately by faith—hangs in the air. It is not until the book is three-quarters done¹⁵ that the needed chapter on The Scriptural Proof of Sanctification by Faith is inserted. The Epistle to the Galatians is taken up first and run through. Then Jellinghaus finds himself compelled to insert a subsection with this heading: "Forgiveness of sins through faith and sanctification through faith are in the New Testament mostly taught together." That is to say, the New Testament does not ("mostly") teach justification through faith and sanctification through faith, but justification and sanctification through faith. He writes:

When we look more closely at the Epistle to the Galatians and the whole New Testament, we find that they do not make so sharp a conceptional distinction between justification and sanctification as we are now accustomed to make, and especially, that the

¹⁵ Part II, ch. VII, p. 557 ff.

words, "righteous, righteousness, justify" often include sanctification in themselves; and again in other passages the word "sanctify" includes forgiveness of sins and justification (p. 567).

He illustrates the first usage by the prophetic declaration, "The just shall live by his faith," which he represents as including sanctification as well as justification, no doubt following W. E. Boardman's interpretation of it. The second he illustrates by Hebrews 10:10. Then he seeks a rationale of the custom he has thus announced:

Precisely because the apostles teach that forgiveness of sins and sanctification both take place by faith apart from works of our own, they do not need to distinguish them so anxiously. So soon, on the other hand, as a forgiveness by faith in Christ alone and a sanctification by faith and works are taught, an exaggerated distinction is necessary, such as is made by many orthodox Lutheran and Reformed Church-teachers, in order that the comfort of the forgiveness of sins may be left in its abiding certainty. With the doctrine of sanctification by faith, on the other hand, the doctrine of forgiveness of sins through faith is given and established almost of itself without hair-splitting distinctions.

He then refers us back to the first part of the volume, where, says he, "we have repeatedly shown that the apostles presented to sinners and taught a direct and immediate reconciliation with God through the surrender of faith to the justifying and purifying Deliverer. Repentant sinners are declared by them at once justified and holy, without waiting for the confirmation of their character in good works, so that forgiveness of sins rests in no way on sanctification, though it of course includes the foundation of all holiness, namely life-union with Christ's blood." The whole drift of the chapter may be treated as summed up in the following words, which are more particularly a comment on the Epistle to the Colossians:

As in the Epistle to the Ephesians, so also in that to the Colossians, it is taught that the believer, through the surrender of faith, has part in all that Jesus experienced, so that he has died with

Christ, risen again, and has been transferred into the heavenly, the supramundane kingdom of God. This is taught so crisply that it must be assumed that this doctrine and this conception of the Deliverer had already been proclaimed to them by Epaphras and the rest, since otherwise they would not have been able to understand it from this brief presentation. These fundamental truths were already the common property of the apostolic congregations in Asia * * * (p. 571).

There is no evidence presented here that the New Testament represents sanctification as received immediately by faith. In point of fact there is no direct statement to that effect in the New Testament. It is to Jellinghaus' credit that he does not adduce for it either Acts 15:9 or 26:18, which are often made to do duty in this sense.¹⁶ His strong conviction that sanctification is obtained directly and immediately by faith is a product not of his Scriptural studies, but of his "mediating theology." According to that theology, when we receive Christ by faith we receive in Him all that He is to us at once; all the benefits which we receive in Him are conceived as received immediately and directly by the faith through which we are united with Him and become sharers in all that He is. Justification and sanctification, for example, are thought of as parallel products of faith. This is not, however, the New Testament representation. According to its teaching, sanctification is not related to faith directly and immediately, so that in believing in Jesus we receive both justification and sanctification as parallel products of our faith; or either the one or the other, according as our faith is directed to the one or the other. Sanctification is related directly not to faith but to justification; and as faith is the instrumental cause of justification, so is justification the instrumental cause of sanctification. The *vinculum* which

¹⁶ He does, however, adduce Acts 15:9 in this sense elsewhere. For Acts 26:18, see p. 567.

binds justification and sanctification together is not that they are both effects of faith—so that he who believes must have both—because faith is the *prius* of both alike. Nor is it even that both are obtained in Christ, so that He who has Christ, who is made to us both righteousness and sanctification, must have both because Christ is the common source of both. It is true that he who has faith has and must have both; and it is true that he who has Christ has and must have both. But they do not come out of faith or from Christ in the same way. Justification comes through faith; sanctification through justification, and only mediately, through justification, through faith. So that the order is invariable, faith, justification, sanctification; not arbitrarily, but in the nature of the case.

For the main matter, however, Jellinghaus' expositions of the Scriptural material are not only true, but both obvious and important. It is not exact to say that the New Testament makes no conceptional distinction between justification and sanctification. But it is true to say that it is absolutely impatient of their separation from one another, and uniformly represents them as belonging together and entering as constituent parts into the one, unitary salvation which is received by faith. The significance of Jellinghaus' exposition of the Scriptural material is that by it it is made perfectly clear that no support from the New Testament can be obtained for separating them and representing them as two distinct benefits which may be obtained apart from each other by separate acts of faith.

Jellinghaus cannot quite make up his mind, however, to renounce altogether the notion of a "second blessing." With the form in which he received this notion from his Higher Life teachers, of course, he has definitely broken.

He cannot teach that we first receive justification by faith, and then, afterwards, receive sanctification by a different faith. He knows very well that justification and sanctification cannot, according to the New Testament, be thus separated. But from his own standpoint—of the “mediating theology”—he was prepared to look upon sanctification as obtained immediately by faith and not solely through the medium of justification; and on that ground he endeavors to save the notion, at least, of the “second blessing,” by representing the distinction between the first and the second blessing as turning, not on the distinction between justification and sanctification, but on that between partial and complete sanctification. Justification and sanctification are, of course, received together, that is, some sanctification. But there is room for more sanctification. Why not say that complete sanctification remains to be obtained through a new act of faith directed to it specifically? Of course, this is just as incongruous with the fundamental postulate of the “mediating theology” as the distinction which has been discarded in its favor. According to this postulate, when we enter into “mystical union” with Christ, we receive in Him all that He is and has, all at once. He is ours and all that is in Him is ours. It may be possible to make room for a progressive realization in life of the great riches which we receive all at once in Him in principle. But for a new beginning, made by a new act of faith, scarcely. There is no room for those who are already in Christ, sharers in all that He is and has, once more, by a new act, to enter into Christ and to obtain as a second benefit from Him something entirely new.

Jellinghaus finds himself, therefore, in almost as great difficulties in validating his new doctrine of the “second blessing,” according to which it is an increase in

sanctification at a definite time and in response to a definite act of faith, as he would have been in, had he retained the old doctrine, according to which the "second blessing" of sanctification was contrasted with the "first blessing" of justification. We can scarcely blame him in these circumstances that, in his exposition of his doctrine of the "second blessing," he moves along a somewhat winding path. Sometimes he seems to reduce it to merely a doctrine of progressive sanctification. Sometimes, in order to regain its distinctiveness as a "second blessing," he appears to be almost ready to make it merely a subjective experience—the growing Christian's sudden realization of what has been happening to him really in unbroken progress. Sometimes he seems even half inclined to confine it to badly taught Christians, in order to obtain room for a decisive change for the better; those who begin badly naturally may have to begin over again. But in the end he comes back to what seems to be a decided reaffirmation of the experience, though in a considerably attenuated form.

In one of the earlier instances of his discussion of the possibility of a sudden advance in the Christian's experience the matter is approached through an exposition of conversion. There is a divine side and a human side to conversion; and so far as it is a human work, it admits of degrees, because both the repentance and the faith which constitute this side of it are capable of continuous deepening. From this point of view a Christian may find himself repenting and believing over and over again.

Inasmuch as every increase of faith includes within itself a deepening of repentance, the phrase "daily repentance" may be employed in a good sense, when what is meant by daily repentance is not an expectation of daily repeated falls into known sins and a weak complaining regret for them, and such a continuous

condition of spiritual weakness and lamentation is not held to be necessary.¹⁷

Even the child of God who is converted and is walking in sanctification should always perceive afresh and with increasing clearness how guilty, sinful and impotent to all good he is in himself, and what grace and power he has in Jesus. Yes, when the defects of his Christian life are really made clear by God's Spirit to a Christian and then he finds in faith greater unsuspected grace and gracious power in Jesus, it is to him often as if he were newly converted. From this it may be explained that many Christians have erroneously called by the name of a "second conversion" their experience, after long stumbling, of fuller sanctification in the power of Christ's blood through their fuller surrender to and fuller faith in Jesus as the Deliverer from all sins and as the compassionately leading Good Shepherd (p. 287 f.).

Here an experience presenting itself to the consciousness as revolutionary is explained as only a step in the normal advance of the Christian in the experience of grace. Similarly, we read at another place:

This laying aside of sin and of the old man, as we have said, should begin in conversion, and every converted Christian has a right to hold himself to be dead to sin and crucified with Christ; but nevertheless the fact is apparent that even in the apostolic age the majority of believers had need of an exhortation to do this. When, however, the apostles lay such a requirement on believers, they are not exhorting them to a half and gradual, but to an immediate and complete laying aside of sin. For what one will not do in this matter completely and at once, that he never does rightly and with effect. It is, however, self-evident that no matter how thorough and decisive the renunciation is, there remains a place for a progressive deepening: for when the degree of light on sin increases and new sins are discovered, these new sins also

¹⁷ In contact as he was with a Pietistic community, Jellinghaus was much exercised over the Pietistic idea of the Christian life as a "daily repentance," the exact antipodes of his notion that we receive by faith immediately full sanctification—which leaves no room for daily sins to be repented of. He says (p. 123) that "it is utterly un-Biblical to assume that every believing Christian falls into known sins daily and therefore must repent daily." He says it is unendurable that Christians should pray: "Forgive us the many unconscious and conscious sins which we have done this day." "That is," he asserts, "in the case of really converted Christians, who commit no sin with knowledge and intention, and to whom the saying belongs, 'Rather die than to sin consciously,' a highly unthinking mode of speech" (p. 126). He is thrown into a flutter by every suggestion that Christians "sin daily" or that the mark of the Christian is continuous repentance. We are to repent once for all (p. 122) and after that—not sin. In what sense he is willing to admit the propriety of "daily repentance" the passages quoted in the text show.

must be discarded and they can be laid aside only instance by instance. Where a clear knowledge of Christ's power of deliverance exists, therefore, in the beginning of conversion, and where a faithful conflict is carried on in the power of the blood of Christ—there a more spasmodic, sudden renunciation in the Christian's walk will be less in evidence. Therefore the more clearly the power of the blood of Christ to deliver is preached to souls from the beginning, and grasped by them, the more seldom will these sudden transitions, similar to "second conversions," occur in the life of Christians. (Just as absolutely sudden conversions are less to be expected in the case of those who grow up in good Christian nurture.) When anything like a "second conversion" shows itself in the life of a Christian, it is likely either that there was no accurate knowledge of the right way of salvation possessed in the beginning, or that the converted Christian had fallen into hazardous inner unfaithfulnesses and falterings. This suddenness in the renunciation of sins and deeper sanctification which is so offensive to many would occur more infrequently if the preaching of sanctification in Jesus were clearer (p. 499).

Here certainly the "second blessing" (note the application in the last sentence) is represented not as the normal experience of the heroes of faith, but as an abnormality due either to the insufficient knowledge or to the unfaithful life of the average Christian, which may be expected to be made rarer by faithful preaching.

Of course, in these circumstances, it cannot be taught that the "second blessing" is necessary, if we are to have all that Christ has in Himself for His people. We read without surprise:

It is quite possible, in the case of a Christian soul, that his surrender to Christ in his conversion should be so decisive and complete, and remain so true to his increasing knowledge in the course of his Christian life, and should grow so constantly, that there is no room for a temporally distinct, renewed surrender which essentially and instantaneously changes the inner condition. There is needed only a steady growth of surrender, since no partial disobedience and no partial retrogression is found here. When surrender and trust have been complete from conversion and have grown evenly side by side and soundly—then a distinct, renewed surrender, which would change the inward condition essentially and suddenly for the better, and notably advance it,

would not be possible, precisely because it would be already existent (p. 507).¹⁸

"We are not then to assume," we read on the next page, "that according to the Bible, a second temporally distinct event of a complete surrender must occur in the case of every believing Christian." But it is immediately added: "But according to actual experience, it is true that in the case of most believing Christians a lack of complete faith-surrender and a partial walking in self-seeking or self-sufficiency, or self-tormenting, or world-serving, shows itself in the case of most believing Christians not long after conversion and the first warmth of love." This hardly means anything else than that the need of the "second blessing" is due to the failure of the Christian to receive or use the first blessing aright: it is not an essentially different transaction communicating an essentially different blessing, but only a reparation for past failure. It therefore does not surprise us to find Jellinghaus writing as follows:

Some have maintained in England and America, and very lately in Germany too, that a converted man does not become a complete Christian and does not become a really blessed, powerful instrument for God's kingdom, until he has received suddenly and consciously a second baptism with the Holy Spirit. In this there is only so much true as that a great multitude of men of God have suddenly experienced, after their conversion, a new deep baptism with the Holy Spirit; many of them at a time when the cleansing power of the blood of Christ and the greatness of the love of Christ had come brightly before their eyes in knowledge and experience. But the New Testament nowhere requires a second sudden baptism with the Holy Spirit for all believers. In the case of the most, the deeper filling with the Holy Ghost comes gradually, with sufferings, humiliations and marvelous answers to prayer and deliverances, through the deeper experience of the powers of Christ's death and resurrection. * * * He who teaches that every Christian must have the experience of the eradication of his sinful nature, and of his sinlessness, through a second baptism of the Holy Spirit, is an anti-Biblical fanatic and a victim of delusion (p. 71).

¹⁸ "In the Bible," it is immediately added, not without significance, "most is said of the first surrender at conversion,"

This is in principle to discard the whole idea of the "second blessing" as taught by W. E. Boardman and the Smiths, to say nothing of John Wesley standing in the background.¹⁹

At the very end of his book²⁰ Jellinghaus devotes a page to repeating all this, led thereto by the emergence of what he himself recognizes as the most serious difficulty in the way of the contention that believers must believe again in order to become fully sanctified. This is that we read nowhere in the New Testament that believers are to receive the sanctifying power of the death and resurrection of Christ only by a second surrender. The New Testament writers always refer the duty, the right, the power, to die to sin, to the communion in the death and resurrection of Christ which has been entered into at conversion. Jellinghaus does not think of denying that this is the fact; and he feels constrained to add: "According to the Bible, there is no justification and regeneration which does not already include in itself the essential beginning of all sanctification." That is to say, in brief, the faith which justifies sanctifies—at least in the beginnings of sanctification, beginnings which include in themselves the promise and potency of all sanctification. In these circumstances he feels it necessary to add further that it cannot be denied that it is *possible* (unfortunately he underscores the "possible") "for a Christian at once at justification and regeneration so to enter into communion in the death- and the resurrection-life of Jesus, that he has a power of victory over external and internal sins in Christ or"—he adds—"that he at

¹⁹ The phrase "baptism with the Holy Spirit" means with Jellinghaus just regeneration; *c. g.*, p. 312: "The baptism with the Holy Spirit, that is, regeneration." He does not admit the propriety of its use of a new experience superinduced on regeneration and sanctification, as, for example, "Pastor" Paul used it.

²⁰ P. 691 f.

least so grows gradually into it that there is no question of a particular second point of time for a fuller sanctification." He is compelled to go even further than this, and to say that not only is such an experience *possible* (with the underscored "possible"), but it is in certain circumstances the normal history of the soul. If the soul has been fortunate enough to enjoy from the beginning—the beginning of its life or of its Christian experience—correct instruction with respect to the way of salvation, and has given faithful and unwavering obedience throughout (perhaps we are not to read this as an impossible condition)—why, this is the normal course. He says:

This must be set forth clearly and plainly, that we may not fall into un-Biblical artificialities and repel those who know their Bibles. *A sharp separation of two distinct sorts of sanctification, we do not find in the Bible.* It cannot be taught on Biblical grounds that we must all first be justified and regenerated, and then we must all later, at a definite time and by a sudden, definite transaction, be sanctified in complete fashion (p. 692).

We are sorry that Jellinghaus holds back a little even in this declaration. The Bible not only does not teach that we must "all" be first justified and then by a distinct act of faith "all" be sanctified. It does not teach that any will be so dealt with. What it teaches is that justification and sanctification are but successive steps, inseparably joined together by an immanent bond, in the realization of the one salvation which is received by faith. Jellinghaus does not quite come to this point of view. He says it is *possible* for a man to be sanctified at the same time that he is justified, if—. He is thinking of sanctification not as the necessary issue of justification, included in principle in it, but as some sort of a separate entity, which the Scriptures join with it invariably, it is true, but which is not in the nature of the

case its inevitable consequent. And therefore he at once qualifies even this admission—for it is after all an admission with him. “However true that is,” he adds, “we may not, according to the teaching of the New Testament, and according to Christian experience, maintain that every justified man manifests and must manifest already in his life the whole sanctifying power of the death and resurrection of Christ.”

That is, however, precisely what we must maintain—if we are to be true to the New Testament; that is to say, of course, if we mean it in the New Testament sense. For the words have a certain ambiguity buried in them, and Jellinghaus means them in the wrong sense, in the sense, that is, that sanctification in its completeness is received all at once at the very moment of justification. “We dare not say,” he explains, “that justification and actual sanctification fall absolutely together; that he who is fully justified is sanctified in the full measure in which this is possible on earth; that he who has experienced the sanctifying power of the death and blood of Christ only in a partial way is also not yet fully justified.” And then he appeals to New Testament passages in which those who are assumed to be justified are exhorted to advance in their Christian walk! Of course we dare not say anything of this sort, for sanctification is a progressive thing, as is already allowed indeed when it is pointed out that the New Testament exhorts Christians to advance in their Christian walk. Temptation to say anything of the sort can assail those only who conceive of sanctification as some kind of limited entity which can be received all at once. It is because Jellinghaus so conceives it that he is unable to accept, without qualification, what he himself recognizes as Bible teaching.

If it seems to us that the shadow of the “second

“blessing” to which alone Jellinghaus can cling after this is hardly worth clinging to, especially at the cost he is compelled to pay for it, that is probably because we underestimate the constraint he was under, arising from his doctrine of perfection, to preserve at least some shadow of it. His interest, it is true, does not center immediately in the “second blessing.” But it does center in what he calls, in the title of his book, “full, present salvation through Christ.” He wishes to teach that we may enter by faith alone into the immediate enjoyment of the whole salvation that is in Christ Jesus. Suddenness of entrance into this full salvation belongs accordingly to the essence of his doctrine. Jesus would not seem to him a complete deliverer if we had to wait for the deliverance received in Him to be gradually accomplished in us through a long process of growth, especially if this prolonged itself throughout life. At least our experience of salvation must be at once complete on faith. That indeed is already involved in the postulate of his “mediating theology,” and this is the reason of his strong insistence that sanctification too, as well as justification, must be conceived as objectively perfect and ready for us in Christ, to be taken over from Him by faith alone.

The postulates of his “mediating theology” would interpose no obstacle, it is true, to supposing that this full sanctification, objectively complete, ready for us in Christ, is taken over in the same act of faith by which we receive justification. Rather, they are really patient to no other supposition; and he finds himself in straits on this account as he seeks to save for himself even the shadow of the “second blessing” which he preserves. The Scriptures to which he appeals to justify his doctrine of the immediate reception of complete sanctification by faith, also connect this reception of complete sanctifica-

tion with the same act of faith by which we receive justification. But there were powerful motives operating to prevent Jellinghaus from following in this either the postulates of his fundamental theology or the implication of his Scriptures. It is too clear to be denied, that the Scriptures are full of exhortations to men, assumed to be justified, to make advances in their holy walk, and therefore cannot mean to teach that every justified man is also by the very act by which he received his justification also at once fully sanctified. It is also too clear to be denied that, in point of experience, not all who must be presumed to be justified are fully sanctified—unless we are prepared to refuse to recognize as a Christian at all any one who is not obviously perfect—a position to the intolerableness of which Jellinghaus shows himself to be keenly sensitive.

The assumption of such an attitude towards the Christian body at large would, moreover, abolish the chief religious motive which is urged in justification of the doctrine of immediate sanctification by faith—the need of encouragement for men who, having believed, yet find themselves still undelivered from sinning, and who are ready therefore to despair of salvation itself. These men need to be assured that, despite appearances, they have not believed in vain, that their faith avails for deliverance from the guilt of sin, and the way is open still for them now to believe again for deliverance from its power. Under the stress of such considerations, that he might maintain his fundamental doctrine of immediate sanctification by faith, Jellinghaus was under necessity to preserve at least a shadow of the doctrine of the “second blessing.”

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY.

(To be concluded.)

INHERENT FALSITY AND ETERNAL TRUTH

By WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS, D. D., L. H. D.

WHY was Jesus the foe of tradition? What was most characteristic in His attitude toward the men in charge of the temple and synagogue? Why was His challenge of the public teachers, the priests and the learned in power, so minatory, so constant? Why did He so unceasingly throw the searchlight of the Eternal Word upon their spirit, methods, and usurped authority? The activities of Jesus most nearly approached violence when He attacked what was based on tradition. When His passionate opposition flamed, even into physical action, it was against "accepted custom." Why was this?

On the other hand, the most strenuous, persistent and malignant antagonism against him, deepening into mortal hatred, was because of His indictment of men financially interested in keeping tradition fixed. These men made money and fame by popularizing falsehood. Jesus undermined their popularity and cut the sources of their gains. This, in their eyes, capped the climax and became unpardonable sin. To have their revenues not only curtailed, but stopped, by a strange prophet provoked the resolve of revenge and the determination to death. In their view Calvary gave the quietus to this truth-teller. In reality these sons of murder simply released new moral forces on a grander scale.

Truth is the mightiest of all forms of power, yet it is because of this very fact that, when in the hands of men, it tends to become associated with vested

interests and financial gains. Every motive, physical or moral, is exploited for selfish ends. The very fact that truth, or what is accepted as such by the populace, is so powerful fires the fancy and tempts the ambition of men to gain, hold, and work it for selfish advantage. This makes it inevitably the pathway to personal revenue. Sooner or later the corporation, the syndicate or the trust is formed which controls it as a monopoly. Often the next step is blasphemy. The claim is made of exclusive authorization from God.

Then follows ostracism decreed and ban laid upon critic or opposer. He who persists in challenging, denying or appealing "to the law and to the testimony" is outlawed or punished as a suspect, a heretic, a transgressor of law or a traitor, according to the malignity or power possessed. All revelation of opposing truth is treated as a personal matter, as *lese-majesty*. In their human development, even the laws of Moses, the church of Jehovah, and the religion of Israel have proved no exception to this law of life in a world of sin.

Yet the Great Captain of our Salvation braved all perils of man and the machinery of torture and death, because He saw the inherent falsity of these traditions. Being Himself the truth, He taught that reality did not, and could not, exist in an artificial system of man-made traditions and commandments. Truth, He taught, could be kept and held, in its divine potency, only in a holy life. Freedom by the truth was His paramount theme. Spiritual deliverance from sin, intellectual freedom from the bondage of tradition, the joy of liberty, wherewith He made His children free—that was the burden also of Paul's preaching.

In this, Master and pupil were one. For this is the nature of truth. It is not mere fact. It is neither prohibition nor commandment. It is life. Obedience is the organ of knowledge, and knowledge is power. "If any man do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God."

We may now draw not only a parable, but a "modern instance"—one from the politics of nations and illustrated before our eyes in China and Russia. We see a people that have been kept like children, in passive obedience. They were never trained in self government, but were either commanded or prohibited. Arbitrary kings or emperors, or the bureaucracy that makes puppets of both crown and rulers, having allowed no freedom, there is neither opportunity nor power to prove all things and hold fast that which is good. When, therefore, liberty is wrenched by revolution it quickly becomes anarchy. Whether in the France of 1789 or the Russia of 1917, the sequel is excess and license. Ordered freedom safeguarded by law, liberty as a vital process, must come as a growth and the result of habit in those who have made trial. Both deliverance and vision are vital to freedom—"The Lord releaseth the prisoner; the Lord openeth the eyes of the blind." Such an "experience worketh hope."

So in religion. Spiritual piety can be transformed neither into machinery nor into a system under the control of men who measure it out for a material equivalent in fame or pelf, honor or revenue, popularity or social standing. Nor can it proceed from such a corporation, no matter what the organization claims, even vicegerency of God on earth. In religion there is no analogy with the harnessing of forces in

the sphere of mechanics, or the methods of issue and exchange in the financial world. It is something entirely apart from the craft of politics or diplomacy, or even the greater or less wisdom of ecclesiastical systems, however important these may be as means to an end.

Truth is an end in itself. It is life. Jesus made it terribly clear to word-mongers and peddlers of tradition, that it is the vital view and use of the divine Word itself, by the individual himself, that is acceptable to God. Since religion exists between the Creator and the creature, "there is but one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." Conscience is God's, not man's, province. To multiply mediators, personal or material, is anti-Christ. The more machinery, art, architecture, symbolism, paraphernalia or churchianity, so far as these are considered necessary to salvation, the worse for true religion. The larger the number of those who get their livelihood in handling "religious goods" or by serving the corporation or who profess themselves necessary for the soul's salvation, the fewer souls saved. Yet most systems, as molded by men, tend sooner or later to this excess of machinery and of the parasites of tradition. Buddhism, the protestantism of Asia, in its origin, was a revolt against excess of symbol, altars, priests, and burdensome forms of tradition very unreasonable and very expensive. Yet in time it reproduced the very evils it at first attacked.

How alike are both the pagan religion and some forms of so-called Christianity in this! For in all phases of life, wonderful as it is, we discern this "law of the crust." In the body the soft tissues of babe and child become the bone and muscle which furnish

the glory and strength of young manhood and adult life. Yet as age creeps on, the earthy matter in the osseous system increases, the arteries harden, and the joints gather alien deposits, while the muscles, once so tense and responsive, become flaccid. All too soon in place of the rose tints and the pliant flexibility of youth, we have the rigidity and numbness of age. The earth, out of which we have sprung, asserts its dominion over vital forces.

The same law is discerned in plant life, by which, except under watchful cultivation, the tendency is to leaf and wood. In things plastic the soft clay and the pulp harden, the lubricant thickens, the once potent remedy dries up—the old mass, no longer “nascent” in power, losing its virtue for healing. Indeed this tendency to “set” is seen all through nature and in man’s life, requiring vigilance, industry, and faithfulness to neutralize for efficiency. This law, when discerned, is the stimulus and compeller to noblest virtues. The sword of our spirit is to be, in our hands, neither soft iron nor chilled steel, but skilfully annealed and finely tempered, ever the ready blade by which we win victory over the foes of lust, sloth, and luxury. How to keep pure bodies, as the Old Testament pictures in its Calebs and Joshuas, with “eye undimmed” nor “natural force abated” and our minds alert and open to wisdom and to divine truth in its purity and freshness, is our task and problem. To this we are called, as to honor, joy, and delight. Indeed, it is the test of loyalty. To do this is to follow Christ.

There is ever a strong tendency in human nature to harden truth into hopeless routine that becomes crust and rind, which is as bad as dry rot. The fixing

of the very juices of growing life into inert tissue and the transforming of vital forces into dead matter are notorious. The process was seen and denounced by Jesus, not only in those instances of the reversal of the law's intent and purpose, for example in "corban" and in tithes and washings, which so angered Him, but in weightier matters also. The guilt was double in these instances, because these orthodox sinners were not only case-hardened, themselves, in hypocrisy, but they allowed only the stunted and degraded remnants of truth to their proselytes. It was His unspeakably awful indictment against men who prided themselves upon their respectability and orthodoxy, that they "shut up the kingdom of heaven against men." Could any sin be greater? Yet these men, or at least their predecessors, in the beginning meant well.

Yet let us not gloat over the wicked ancients, so far in time and space from ourselves. Are we any better, when working out the truth in our modern religious and social apparatus? Take, for example, the field of the story of man; what he has been, what he is. The average person imagines, slothfully perhaps, that he must depend for his knowledge of history upon its form in fiction. This is set before him in alluring forms on the stage, in novels, tableaux, pageants, and especially in moving pictures. Official reports show that in England one-half of the population attend the "movies" at least once a day. In Greater New York there are, or were, over two thousand "cinema theatres," or moving-picture places, from the half-dime show in the slums to the Broadway palaces requiring a dollar for admission. When it is reckoned that eighty-five per cent. of all our knowledge comes

through the eye, the power of the film—the superstition and the fad of our day—as an engine for good or evil can scarcely be overestimated.

Yet despite the attractiveness of this general form of appeal to the fancy, the imagination, and the emotions, there lurks in all the methods of presenting the human story in fiction an inherent falsity. In our modern life this tends rather to increase than to decrease. It is all so totally different from the Biblical way of impressing the mind. Exaggeration continually sounds its note, even to distortion. Its verisimilitude is not the healthfulness of nature, but rather the morbidness of guile and craft. The appeal is not to the reason or the understanding but to the emotions, not the noblest; and there is no greater waste of mind than in ineffectual emotion. Indeed, on the whole, the artistic stimulus is not to the imagination, which is the servant of reason, but to fancy, which is the slave of sense. The lower, not the higher, passions are excited. In the majority of cases the examples from real life, as presented on the film, are those which are degradations of true ideals. Everything must be subordinated to the idea of movement and action so as to excite and thrill.

Let one live in the routine of the theater, the drama, the novel or the cinematograph, and he dwells in an unreal, painted world, which deceives and furnishes fruit, such as is alleged to grow near the Dead Sea, fair to the sight but ashes within. Art is a noble servant, often the chaste and faithful handmaid of truth. Indeed, it may be as grand an interpreter of the things of time and of eternity as the angel with the trumpet in Revelation; but of sordid, sensual,

degraded art, how often must we say: O Lucifer, son of the morning, how art thou fallen!

The staple of fictional products is crime or abnormal human nature. The varied episodes of jealousy and murder, revolvers drawn and arms up, the scandalous acts that violate family decency and smirch the marriage vow, the drinking of liquor, as if it were the invariable custom of gentlemen, the revelations of the cabaret, opium joints, dance halls, and burglars' lairs, with copious illustration of how checks are forged or ledger records altered or bank safes cracked, are laid open, and their evil effect on the young are manifest. In one country police officers, in 1916, traced half of the juvenile crime to the blood-and-thunder novel and the idiotic but fascinating film pictures. The ethical value of the average film production, theatrical drama, and novel bears a close relation to the material advantage of "stage" money, titles, scepters, and crowns, so generously furnished and distributed. Tinsel is not gold, nor is printed rag pulp quoted on the market as equal to the coin of the republic.

All this misrepresentation of life as it ought to be, or even as on the average it is, however reprehensible, is a matter of common knowledge and regrettable fact. It is conceded by all non-stockholders and disinterested persons. There are, however, in addition, even more subtle forms of moral corruption. In winning souls away from noble ideals and sound theories of life to those that are degrading to soul and body, the film, novel, and stage are sadly efficient and sometimes fiendishly so.

In almost all historical matters represented in fiction it is not living truth or the substance of reality

that is sought, but rather some mummied form of the facts. That which is embalmed for popular reception and has money or fame in it is the favorite form chosen; that is, one that has hardened into the "accepted" verisimilitudes and will warrant investment of cash to reproduce. Often truth will not pay, when tradition will. Without the vision of knowledge the people perish, and the traditionalists fatten.

For example, a real Puritan—a man brave, chivalrous, hating excess of symbol, with his women dressing decently and becomingly, making a beautiful home, building a glorious state without crown, king or bauble, and a church without royal favorites and politicians to govern it, such as the real Puritan was—is not the Puritan wanted by the playwrights of the gutter or on the stage or on the film or in the "best seller." No, it is rather carefully concealed that John Milton, Oliver Cromwell, and the New England pioneers were Puritans. Even the English verger is very apt, when leading around the tourists, at a sixpence or shilling a head, to let it be supposed that, in Reformation history, it was Oliver instead of Thomas, a republican instead of a monarchist, that devastated the church edifices. Such real truth would set the theater topsyturvy, "queer" the "movies" at once, and even spoil the revenues of the chapter. Instead of an ideal of strong, clean, chivalrous manhood and noblest womanhood, it is a long-faced, snuffing hypocrite, a marplot to all things beautiful, that is set before us. In time of public passion, even in war, what a test of character to tell, live, and make visible to all the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. In the Christian's canticle of thanksgiving and praise to God there should be a daily

versicle, because "truth crushed to earth shall rise again."

Anything that is dramatic or thrilling, even though based on a known falsehood, is a tidbit for the fictionist's maw; though, let us charitably hope, that in most cases it is the elementary lack of a common school education that, on the film, makes possible misinformation to millions. Never in the history of the United States was a witch punished by fire. Yet the burning of witches is not only a fixed tradition, in some sections outside New England, but it is worth dollars to keep up the falsehood in the novels, on the stage, and in moving pictures. It makes such a delightfully dramatic scene, so rich in contrasts, so "throbbing," so thrilling. Americans delight in a picture or story that has a pretty woman in it; and, since we have no Joan of Arc amid flames, an imaginary judicial conflagration, with a lovely girl condemned by the meeting-house worthies in Salem, will do.

Especially in that form of fiction, so popular among us and known as "after-dinner oratory," are those lay figures furnished for the puppet show. The tenacity of the legend of the witch-burner is quite equal to others in the fertile field of American mythology, which is cultivated in our school manuals, wherein what is called the history of the United States is alleged to be taught. In these books the real causes of events, in war and peace, are more or less concealed. Defeats of "our side" are turned into victories. Picturesque incidents blacken traditional enemies, but the saints in our pantheon are mounted, as the armies in Revelation, "upon white horses, clothed in fine linen white and clean."

We are very far from lending countenance for one moment to those who, in a zeal that lacks discrimination of moral and literary values, would abolish fairy tales and banish all works of the imagination from libraries, public and private. Fiction is not opposed to truth, but to fact. Often fiction is the most appropriate, as it is the most effective, vehicle of truth, especially to children and immature minds not versed in the higher, because less obvious, laws of cause and effect. For directness and ease to the immature mind the parable, the allegory, and the fable are necessities. The Bible itself is full of works of fiction, that is of elect forms of everlasting truth set forth in finest artistry of literary form and choicest language. It was not a mistake in the divine Spirit to choose for the language of inspiration the choicest in the Semitic family and one that makes pictures in its very words. The allegories, similes, and metaphors of the Old Testament and the divinely beautiful parables of Jesus do not represent fact, but truth. They are not photographic copies of things in routine, but pleasing representations in color, shot through with flashes of creative imagination, and with many an artist's touch of spiritual reality.

On the other hand, to represent ideals as tested by fallible man, that is, truth only partially incarnated in human beings, imperfect men and women even the best of them, the Holy Spirit has chosen history, in which the Bible is very rich in quantity, while super-fine above all other historiography in realistic truth. When, however, the inspired writer would express absolutely perfect spiritual realities higher than human limitations the parable and the allegory—works of literary fiction—are chosen. The most vivid and

weighty messages from God, unalterable for all time, are the great imaginatives of the Old Testament. The matchless messages of truth from the lips of Jesus, even those that unveil eternity, are presented in parables.

In Biblical interpretation, the habit of uncompromising literalism ruins the truth, by defacing those literary pictures which, in ages before writing, printing, books, canvas or oil painting, laboratories or universities, were framed in imperishable forms of beauty and with compelling charm. After forty centuries modern civilization, science, and art, with all their wealth of resources in expression of color, motion, print, engraving, drama, photograph, film, and tableaux, can neither add anything nor improve aught. Even to-day the Bible is the supremely "best seller."

A host of the profoundest students of Scripture and of purely literary critics, in all ages and in all lands, unite in the conviction that, even apart from its claims to divine revelation, its sacredness, from long test and use, the Bible could hold its own because of its matchless beauty, its inimitable charm, and its unique literary substance.

It is not fiction in itself that we attack, or the value of which we depreciate. This is the last thing we should desire. Let us in fullest liberality of mind grant freedom of method to any and all forms of innocent amusement and the right of the men of art and literature to express themselves in forms sanctioned by Holy Writ and as old as letters; yes, even to experts of the pen and brush, camera, and stage carpentry. But let us also remember, in order rightly to condition and moderate our opinions and practice, two things: That the ancient Hebrews had no theater,

and that Jesus chose as His word and stigma for hypocrite that of stage-actor. A "hypocrite," in the New Testament, is, in metaphor, the masked man who assumes a character not his own and who speaks through a false face.

Even when, in fullest freedom, we interpret certain literary forms in the Bible, such as the Wisdom or the Apocalyptic literature, parables, allegories, etc., let us also note that in no case were the utterances of the poet, prophet, teacher or winsome narrator associated with methods of gain or selfish advantage in any form. Here, it seems to me, is the key to the whole problem. On the contrary, there are in the Bible no denunciations of evil-doing more scorching than those that are directed against men and women who plied the trade of the prophet and seer with the idea of filling their purses. Certainly the tongue of Jesus, ever dropping words of compassion like gentle rain to the trembler at God's Word, became as lightning that shrivelled in flames to those who supposed that gain was godliness. With all the undoubted proofs of wit, humor, and sarcasm in the Bible, there is no real caricature or confusion as to right and wrong and their issues. In their masterly portrayal of character and interpretations of events, the inspired writers are wholly free from the motives which so manifestly actuate the modern author, film maker, and stage manager.

There are in the Bible numerous examples of the most fearful denunciation, of scathing invective, and of vehement passion. The Psalmist's maledictions and imprecations—such as the Christian, in his responsive readings, can scarcely bear to take on his lips

to-day, even though he impersonalizes them as directed at evil, instead of evil-doers—are notable examples; but in all these there is no destruction of the boundaries between right and wrong, sin and holiness. There is no such inextricable blending of the good and bad, making the worse appear the better reason, no doing evil that good may come, no subtle incentive to go and do likewise in sin, as in too many of our modern books, and even some that are nominally but weakly “religious.” Black is black, and white is white. The narratives and general tenor of Scripture—as parents who put Bibles into the hands of their children to read through so often notice—do not disturb even the susceptibilities of a child. In fact, one of the proofs of the divine inspiration of the Scriptures is the ease with which a boy or girl may read these ancient writings, with slight jolt or none to mind or conscience.

Now, against all these modern methods of appeal to the passions and the imagination, which are in the direct interest of gain, pelf, and the kind of fame that so many low characters itch to win, is set over that simple majesty and sweetness of truth, as presented in the Scripture, which “age cannot wither nor custom stale.” Picture Benjamin Franklin reading the idyll of Ruth to the beauties and favorites of a Bourbon Court who innocently inquire where this exquisite bit of “Oriental literature” may be found! Here the method and spirit are wholly different. Apart from any buttress to its popularity, which even kingly thrones and church corporations can furnish or ecclesiastics may control, the Bible for all time, in the future as in the past, excels every other “best seller” because of its divine simplicity and undecorated truth. Like

the Puritan garb—a dress invented by godly men and women in a meretricious age—here is beauty that is, “when unadorned, adorned the most.”

As with the exaggerations, superlatives, and expletives, so common in the conversation of our young people, there is an inherent falsity in modern presentation, because it must of necessity accord with what is popular, palatable at the time, pecuniarily profitable, and be framed to suit the unstable taste of the age, however these may be opposed to truth, purity, and righteousness. How many zealots are strenuous for what they insist upon as *the* truth, because it is the “cribbed, cabined and confined” form which they have received as official in their sect or clique. In the Bible, on the contrary, we have not *a* truth or *the* truth or official truth that has passed the censor or is approved by authority, tradition or a majority vote. Truth by itself alone, without adjective or explanation, truth that was and is and is to come, is sought and told. That is the way truth is presented in divine inspiration. “No prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation,” or is of any worth or more authority because of a corporation seal or an individual autograph. It is self evident, in the experience of the child of God and his consciousness of what is its pillar and ground—which some one sect or corporation will ever claim to be, but which Jesus sufficiently mapped, defined, and validated, when He answered the question, in terms of all time: “Who is my mother?”

Let anyone study carefully the use of “truth,” in the Gospel of John in which this word is used relatively oftenest. To the professional ecclesiastic or politician, Caiaphas or Pilate, or man of the world,

this word is only a counter. To him who has opened his heart to the Christ it is a coin. In this Gospel of John, the heart of divine revelation, the word "truth" is used oftenest abstractly. It has no article or adjective. Invariably when "the" truth is spoken of or referred to it is Jesus Himself, for He was, He is, the truth. In strict logic, then, He was uniquely divine. He was "the express image of his person," even as the character struck on the face of the coin is the precise copy of that in the die.

In this faith the apostles followed with voice and pen. Even when leaving truth unembodied, metaphysical or abstract, the inspired writers limned the lives of the heroes of faith, we have no concealment of human nature in its reality. Neither sin nor infirmity, as in the case of Abraham or David, is cloaked, whether in malice or extenuation, but is fully acknowledged. The writer expects neither loss nor gain, popularity nor unpopularity, criticism nor condemnation. He simply gives the facts and tells the truth. When even the Father of the faithful tells a lie to Pharaoh because of the beauty of his wife Sarah; or Israel's king adds murder to covetousness, lust, and adultery; or Solomon becomes oppressor and, by his harem, outrages at once the law of Eden and the nation's homes, the photograph of fact is left untouched. How different this is from the action of a certain sultan of Turkey. In his remarkable type of piety and excess of orthodoxy he refused to allow the importation of the Bible Society's chief printed product, because, forsooth, it made no secret of Solomon's uxorious excesses. On the other hand, when the doings of Pilate and the Jewish rulers, the traitor, the tormentors, and the murderers

of Jesus are narrated in the Bible there are no lurid adjectives of hate or personal bitterness. Most wonderfully cool, exact, artless, passionless, while intense in subdued feeling, are the narratives of the trial and crucifixion—a model of truth for all time.

How divinely careless, also, of any false consistency and excess of self consciousness, such as plagues little souls, is the Eternal Word! How self-purgative of offense, as the ages roll on, is the Bible! The Holy Spirit, as Jesus so often recalled to His disciples, revealed truth as man was able to bear it; but it leaves the record of the past untouched except as showing man's growth and progress under the divine education. Thus the Bible becomes the best, in form and spirit, while the most trustworthy of all histories.

It is "the glory of God," even as a wise parent in training a child, "to conceal a thing" at one time and to reveal it at another. How faithful the record, not fearing to be submerged under the rollers of ever-changing taste and fashion, the Rock of Ages, outliving every storm. Or, if itself an ocean of truth, it is ever preserved in freshness by its own salt. We give thanks to its Creator, while admiring its power to outlast all revolutions. Our panegyric is sincere when we cry, as before the illimitable ocean: "Such as at creation's dawn beheld, thou rollest now." In gratitude to the Author, we exclaim: "Thy judgments are a great deep." We do not deny its solemn tones nor forget that the record of Jesus is more of tears than smiles. He saw too deeply for mirth. Yet that is true also of the ocean of human life and history. "There is sorrow on the sea; it cannot be quiet." Or if, under the figure of the faithfully tended lighthouse,

we regard the Bible as the great illuminator of the ages, we sing as our fathers joyfully did:

It gives a light to every age,
It gives but borrows none.

Yet not as a lamp that must often be filled or a candle quickly burned is the object of our praise. As in the 119th Psalm, the Eternal Word is the unceasing light, as of the sun. Thanks for a book, a literature, a divine message, that survives all changes of taste and time!

Any presentation of truths based on the motive for gain or shaped to win the plaudits of the fad, fashion, or taste of the time, is, in its very nature, defective, for it carries within itself the seed of its own destruction, a seed not only of decay, but of falsehood. Biblical truth, set forth in realism, without apology for aught, or to any of the mighty or the lowly, lives forever; nor is there power to destroy it. It neither bends to the storm of hate, nor withers before the blast of disapproval. It owns no sect, name, potentate or human organization. Having seen whole civilizations buried and having witnessed the passing of empires and rulers, it has respect only to the eternal; nor to its truths can there be bounds. The only way for a corporation to seize what even the incarnate Son of God "counted not * * * a thing to be grasped" is to claim that which Jesus waived when "taking the form of a servant." Certain emperors, both pagan and professed Christian, and more than one congregation of sinners have done this. Hence, alert, watching and praying, as our Lord commanded, we must "take on the whole armor of God."

Therefore may the lover of real art, of pure fiction, of innocent mirth, while using the world as not abusing

it, rejoice as one who, while admiring, discerns between wave and rock, tinted leaf and abiding tree, brilliant planet and steady star. Beside the running rivers, he thinks also of the sea; amid blooming flowers, of the constant earth; in fleeting time, of the eternal ages. Knowing that this earth's most glorious beauty is as a fading flower, he deceives not himself amid the change and decay in all things. He hears God's call to joy when summoned to behold His Word written forever in the heavens. His rapture deepens when the address of Jesus, to him as believer, becomes personal: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." "The world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." And His name—the name also of the witness-bearer to the truth, the Promiser and the Lover of our souls—is "the Word of God."

ITHACA, NEW YORK.

A CLOSED QUESTION REOPENED

By GEORGE MCCREADY PRICE, M. A., Professor of Chemistry and Physics, Lodi Academy, California; author of *The Fundamentals of Geology*, *Back to the Bible*, Q. E. D., or *New Light on the Doctrine of Creation*, etc.

I

I WONDER how many of my readers consider the question of Evolution *versus* Creation as closed and settled, if not for all time, at least for the present?

There is no doubt that some scientists think this question settled, and settled to their liking. In the minds of these people the rather warm discussion which went on during the latter part of the nineteenth century over the various subdivisions of this larger question was but the last incident in the long, painful struggle of rational thought to free itself from the trammels of dogma and traditionalism; and they congratulate themselves that the incident is now happily and satisfactorily closed. This would be the attitude of mind of the orthodox followers of Huxley, Spencer, and Haeckel, if we may suppose that any unquestioning disciples of these men still survive.

On the other hand, there are multitudes of people who regard this question as still *sub judice*. The discussion of it seems to be quiet for the time being, few showing any very active interest in it. But these people hold that so far as the question seems to be settled it has been settled on the wrong side; and in their heart of hearts they hope that some day, the whole subject will have a new hearing, and this time be settled right. As for the various attempts to harmonize the first chapter of Genesis with the geological ages, the "restitution," or "interval," theory

of Chalmers and Buckland has long been abandoned, while the "day-period" theory of Cuvier, Hugh Miller, and Sir William Dawson is admitted to be a pretty poor fit, though it still prevails quite generally (aside from the out and out evolutionary view) as the best explanation available. In short, most Christian people regard the problem here spoken of as at present in a very unsatisfactory condition, and although they may show but a languid interest in the subject, they hope that before long something will turn up to reverse the apparent victory which the evolutionists have been claiming for well nigh a generation.

Both these positions alike illustrate the dominance, the primacy, in our thinking of those deeper moral and spiritual principles which are really the governing factors in man's life and in all his beliefs. But we cannot pause to consider the fascinating psychological and metaphysical problems of which we here catch a glimpse or two. We must pass on to consider how the new scientific evidences which have lately become available are of a nature decidedly to hearten those whom I have represented as all along expecting something of the sort to turn up. As the old proverb expressed it: "When you are right, you are more right than you think you are."

II

Having glanced at the contrasted interests involved in the question here proposed, let us take up the consideration of one phase of the general problem of origins, namely, the geological. To state our problem in a brief way, we may propose for ourselves the question: Are we justified in saying, in the light

of modern scientific knowledge, that there once was a real world catastrophe, corresponding to what a universal ethnic tradition calls the Flood or the Deluge? But while this question obviously has many and strong religious interests, we shall here endeavor to study the matter entirely from the scientific point of view, contenting ourselves with noting at the close some obvious implications which show the relationship of this geological question to the larger problem of origins considered in its religious aspects.

But preliminary to any presentation of the scientific facts involved, we must first note how essential, how vital to any discussion of the problem of origins, is the subject of geology. Historically and logically geology is the keystone of the evolutionary arch; for, as popularly understood, geology furnishes an outline of a long series of life forms which successively arose and perished, the series all the time becoming not only more and more like the forms now living on the earth, but also in general becoming constantly more and more advanced in the scale of existence. In a general way those forms of life that are regarded as geologically "earlier" are less specialized or lower in the taxonomic scale, while those regarded as "later" are in general more specialized or higher in the scale of life. This great outstanding fact of geology as commonly taught is so strong, so compelling, as evidence of a graded advance in the scale of existence from the earlier to the later that the human mind instinctively says the earlier and less specialized must in all probability have developed by some sort of natural process into the later or more specialized, even though it should prove impossible to recover all the various stages in the transformation, or even be impossible to

show how the transformation of species into species really took place.

Quite obviously the value of the geological series as an argument in favor of biological evolution depends entirely upon the accuracy of the serial arrangement of the fossils in a true *chronological order*, an order which until recently has never been seriously questioned. But it is this chronological order of the fossils which should be most carefully and critically examined by scientists to-day, and the present paper is chiefly concerned in outlining some features of such a proposed critical examination.

But another essential idea, second only in importance to the doctrine of the definite order of successive life forms, is the geological theory of *uniformity*. Under this theory the changes recorded in the rocks are always interpreted, if possible, according to the activities of the forces of nature now known to be operating in our modern world. In general it is doubtless a correct scientific attitude of mind to assume for all past time the prevalence of the modern observed behavior of the elements, until we find some positive evidence to the contrary. The burden of proof rightly rests upon those who claim to have discovered such abnormality; but in geology, as in jurisprudence, it becomes crass stupidity or dogmatic stubbornness to refuse to admit the value of abnormal conditions when their abnormality can be completely and thoroughly established. And logically and scientifically there ought to be no more reluctance to face the possibility of some wholly abnormal action of the elements at some past time than there is now to face the evidence of a murder or of some other criminal act in one hitherto supposed to be of upright life. In

either case, while reluctant to admit the evidence, the scientific attitude of mind is to pronounce the conclusion fearlessly and honestly whenever the evidence is of sufficient cogency to make the conclusion certain beyond reasonable doubt.

I am not at present concerned with the truth or the falsity of this doctrine of geological uniformity. This question will come later. I am considering now only its relationship to the general doctrine of biological evolution, and in studying this relationship I cannot do better than to quote the testimony of Huxley as to how he was led to accept the doctrine of biological evolution. Early in life he had devoted considerable study to geology and paleontology, and he says that in his case Charles Lyell, with his theory of uniformity, "was the chief agent in smoothing the road for Darwin. For consistent uniformitarianism postulates evolution as much in the organic as in the inorganic world."

This evidence of one of the clearest thinkers of the nineteenth century should be conclusive as to the fact that biological evolution must stand or fall with geological uniformity. The reason for such an intimate connection between these two ideas becomes evident immediately when we consider how the fact of there having been a real world catastrophe at some time in the long past would destroy completely any remaining confidence we might still have in the accuracy of the geological time scale, effecting this result by rendering incredible and absurd the precise order of the long geological series. For if a world cataclysm has really intervened between our modern world and those times recorded in the oldest stratified rocks, how are we to limit definitely the kind and

¹Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley, Vol. 1, p. 168.

amount of work done by this cataclysm, saying that only a certain limited few animals and plants were made extinct by this event, and then confidently arrange all the other fossils in single file, as if such a catastrophe had never happened?

Obviously, a real world cataclysm overtaking a world somewhat like our own, fully stocked with plants and animals, could not fail to leave a trail of disorder and disaster behind it which would hopelessly obscure or disarrange all former deposits, or at least would render utterly absurd the easy confidence with which we would attempt still to arrange in alleged chronological order the forms of life found in the stratified rocks, trusting to the infallibility of our arrangement of the fossils so implicitly as to maintain it as the framework, the skeletal outline, on which to build an elaborate scheme of biological evolution.

Much more might be presented along the same line, but enough has been said to illustrate the important truth that biological evolution rests, both as to its logic and its history, on the geological succession of plants and animals in a very definite order of sequence, while this precise order of successive ages of varying forms of life is inseparably joined in origin and in destiny with the doctrine of quietism, or uniformity. Thus it is perfectly correct to say that historically and logically the doctrine of evolution rests on the assumption of geological uniformity, and on the implicit or explicit denial of anything like a world cataclysm or a universal deluge. Manifestly, belief in biological evolution and belief in a world cataclysm cannot well be entertained by the same mind, for they are mutually exclusive, the one evacuates the other of all meaning. In other words, the geological

part of the evolutionist's argument is really the crucial part of the whole controversy, though strangely enough it has received practically no consideration whatever for a half century, during which every nook and corner of the biological domain was being examined with the most minute care.

Mendelism is doubtless a splendid retort to Darwinism; and had Mendel's work been known from the first, Darwin's elaborate guessing could never have grown popular among careful scientists. But not in the biological intricacies connected with the supposed origin of species shall we find the real *hiatus valde deflendus* of the evolutionist's argument, but in *his geology*. And a full realization of the relationships of these subjects is of the utmost importance for any one who wishes to get his logical bearings amid the confusing camouflage so long thrown around the problem of origins.

Accordingly, I think that our next inquiry would naturally be: What is the present status of this subject of a universal deluge, in the light of modern scientific discovery?

III

Some further remarks are necessary here regarding the peculiar situation occupied by the science of geology among the other natural sciences. In many respects geology is the most recondite and the most specialized of all the sciences; it is an aristocrat among plebeian companions; and no other branch of science, save perhaps medicine, has such a varied and voluminous literature. All this is largely because it necessarily builds on the finished results of all the other sciences, chemistry, physics, biology, embryology,

astronomy, etc. The inevitable result is that a man is not properly prepared to review understandingly the general teachings of geology without an adequate training in practically all the other sciences. But no one can attain this broad familiarity with all the other sciences until comparatively late in life, or at least until after many long years of post-collegiate work. On the other hand, no one can hope to become a leader in the science of geology as now developed without an early specialization in it and an exclusive and tireless application to it for the greater part of a lifetime.

The combined result of these two mutually reacting tendencies is, that in the ordinary course in geology, as given in college or university as a part of the usual liberal or professional course of study, only a very superficial view of the science is obtained, and this superficial view is almost wholly traditional (as contradistinguished from inductive and experimental) in character, and far more than is true of any of the other sciences, is based on the authority of supposed experts. Overspecialization and a tendency to rely more and more on expert authority are growing evils in almost all the sciences; but not in all the others combined is there such implicit trust in authority demanded of the young student as in the first year or two in the study of geology, if we consider this study in its biological and philosophical aspects, apart from its merely mineralogical and economic aspects, which are eminently practical enough and based on reality rather than on expert testimony.

Then too the general methods of investigation pursued in the science of geology are open to serious criticism. In any truly heuristic or scientific method

of studying the whole phenomena of past geological events, the *surface rocks*, or the rocks of the Tertiary and Pleistocene formations, would never be, as Zittel says they have been, "the last to be understood," and their study only attempted after an artificial chronological series had been started by *a priori* methods of reasoning away back at the dawn of a past eternity, and the pretty scheme of a chronological series had been all arranged according to the doctrine of uniformity and brought down to modern times. The very natural result of such an unscientific method is that, failing to make a good splice of these two systems of slipshod investigation, the ancient and the modern, we have for over half a century been laboring under what Sir H. H. Howorth expressively calls a "glacial nightmare," and these deposits on the very top of the ground "still remain," as Zittel says, "in many respects the despair of geology."

The trouble is we have been following an illogical, unscientific method. How can we hope to get anywhere by a method which starts with what we know the least about, the far distant past, and forces our more definite and accurate knowledge of living plants and animals and the present action of the elements to square with our armchair theories of the origin and burial of the fossil world? The current system of geology has never even professed to conform to the rules of Baconian science in its primary principles and fundamental methods. On the other hand, as a burlesque on inductive science, it has always started with some hypothetically "oldest" forms, and after having located them away back at the vanishing point of the vistas of a past eternity, has trusted to its clever skill in dead-reckoning to be able to travel by

slow stages up to modern times, and to arrive here with a sufficiently small cargo of "living" or "modern" species unaccounted for to join onto the present world smoothly and easily on the basis of Lyell's uniformity and slow secular change. Such is geology by hypothesis, the only one of the natural sciences still conducted according to scholastic methods and the traditions of a bygone age. When this naturally splendid science is regenerated and brought into harmony with the methods pursued in all the other sciences, it will of course reverse this method and start with our modern world as a whole, and *by regression will work back into the past*, finding where and how all our modern plants and animals occur as fossils, in what condition and connection, and will then try to decide how these fossils happen to be there and how the intervening changes took place. In this way, by studying all the fossils taken collectively, and comparing the ancient total with the living forms of the modern world as a whole, we might hope to frame a world-embracing theory or generalization regarding the fossil world which would have some claim to finality, because it would be based on objective facts handled according to sound scientific methods of reasoning.

Apology for the present peculiar conditions has often been made by the remark that geology is yet in its infancy, that it is one of the youngest of the sciences, and that when it has attained more years and experience it will probably develop better methods.

The highly speculative character of most of the geological discussions about the beginning of the nineteenth century, between the Neptunists and the Vulcanists and between the Catastrophists and the Uni-

formitarians, doubtless gave rise to this notion of the youthfulness of the science, for the general results of geology were certainly slow in gaining recognition. It long held a place in public opinion not much higher than is now accorded to numismatics or to the so-called "science" of phrenology. Comte, in his classification of the sciences, issued in 1820, denied a place to geology altogether, on the ground that it was not properly a distinct science at all, but only a field for the application of the sciences. Even Whewell, in his *History of the Inductive Sciences*, published about twenty years later, said about the same thing, declaring that "the Newton of Geology" had not yet appeared.² In fact, the nineteenth century was well advanced before geology had gained a secure and well recognized place among the other natural sciences.

But in the larger view of the matter, in the more correct sense, geology is really one of the oldest of the sciences. So venerable and mature, indeed, is it that its basic principles and methods have scarcely changed an iota in a hundred years, and were taught as they are now taught long before the most essential facts and principles of the related sciences were known.

Thus, as Zittel says, the theories of the igneous origin of the crystalline rocks "had been laid without the assistance of chemistry," and before anything was known of the microscopic structure of these rocks.³ In a similar way the whole of the series of fossil plants and animals had been blocked off, and even most of the details pretty well arranged and fixed previous to 1820, or before anything of importance was known of any class of living animals save mammals.⁴

²Vol. II, p. 580.

³*History of Geology and Palaeontology*, pp. 327, 341.

⁴*Op. cit.*, pp. 128-137.

In the light of recent disclosures tending to discredit some of the oldest theories of the science, this undisputed fact of the early rise of the geological methods and conclusions, which, with little or no modification, still retain the confidence of the public, has its own peculiar significance. So many far-reaching transformations have been witnessed in recent years in all the other sciences, that it seems strange that geology (in its theoretical aspects) has remained so nearly stationary during all these decades. To some people it appears almost incredible that this science, the one above all others dependent upon the accurate results of all the other sciences, both physical and biological, should thus by some happy chance spring into existence full grown long in advance of the others, and need so little adjustment or revision thereafter. In the minds of such people the suspicion is quite naturally awakened: Is it a remarkable instance of almost miraculous perfection from the beginning, as Minerva came full grown from the head of Jove, or is it rather a sad case of atrophy or arrested development?

IV

After a rigid uniformitarianism had held absolute control of the science of geology for some two generations, there was in the latter part of the nineteenth century a rather notable revival of a certain feature of catastrophism; for several well-known geologists defended the proposition that the human race really did witness a world disaster, comparable to what is spoken of in the Bible as the Flood. Not to mention a number of earlier minor writers, Sir H. H. Howorth, in three monumental works, seemed to make out a strong case for a huge aqueous catastrophe as really

the cause of the extinction of many species of animals, the cause of those widespread deposits attributed to continental glaciers, and if not the cause at least the inseparable accompaniment of that (seemingly) world-wide and sudden change of climate by which the mammoths and other large quadrupeds, that once luxuriated in a mild spring-like climate away within the Arctic Circle, were overwhelmed, and their carcasses frozen so suddenly that the flesh is still often found untainted after so many uncounted centuries. Sir Joseph Prestwich, of Oxford University, in a somewhat timid way and in a very singular volume,⁵ brought forward other phenomena from Southern Europe to confirm the general idea of a huge catastrophe in which the lands around the Mediterranean basin were involved. In our own country G. F. Wright has become widely known as advocating a somewhat similar catastrophe in which the early members of the human race were involved, and he claims to have found abundant geological evidence of this aqueous convulsion in many widely scattered parts of the Old World. Even Eduard Suess, of Vienna, the Nestor of living geologists, teaches a somewhat similar catastrophe as having once overtaken the early members of the human race in the southwestern part of Asia.

But all these so-called "floods" or "deluges" are (as described by their advocates) more or less local affairs, and all alike labor under the same strange inconsistency of supposing that such an event could happen our world and yet leave but a comparatively small amount of geological changes behind it as the result of its work. But in view of the modern collapse

⁵The Tradition of a Flood, 1895.

of the theory of geological "ages" (as will be explained later), it becomes utterly impossible to draw any sharp line of distinction between the changes produced by this admitted catastrophe and those other geological changes commonly supposed to be much older. In short, this tardy admission of modern geologists, that there really was a Deluge after all, *proves too much*, if it proves anything. For if we once admit one such event as happening to the world in which man and the other modern species of animals and plants were living side by side contemporary with one another, where shall we limit its ability to disturb the entire economy of nature, and to churn the land and water all up together, leaving the present simply as the wreck of that previous world? If a number of burglaries resembling one another in execution have taken place in a town, and a well-known criminal is convicted of having done one of these "jobs," it seems a very natural and indeed a truly scientific inference to suppose that he may also have performed the others.

Furthermore, and even more important, how shall we proceed on sound scientific principles to discriminate among the whole world of fossils that may have had to run the gauntlet of such an aqueous convulsion and to fix on only a certain limited few of them whose extinction was due to this catastrophe, and then at our leisure tabulate the remainder off on the percentage system (*à la* Charles Lyell), or according to their resemblance to modern embryonic development (*à la* Agassiz), as if such a catastrophe had never happened?

For it is evident on a little consideration that the current system of geology is wholly built up from the

Cambrian to the Pleistocene on the implied, but no less absolute, denial that any such catastrophe has ever happened to the world in which man and a full stock of plants and animals were living contemporaneously; for one such event happening to our modern interdependent world is enough to make the whole pretty scheme found in our textbooks tumble like a house of cards. Any real world disaster happening to a fully stocked world, such as our own, strikes at the very foundation of uniformitarianism, and casts a dark pall of doubt over every conclusion as to how and when even the so-called "older" deposits were produced.

V

I need not here argue for the possibility of a universal deluge, or that it would be competent to blot out of existence whole races of plants and animals in every portion of the globe. An elementary consideration of the relative proportion of land and water leaves us with a sense of wonder that the ocean in modern times keeps so obediently within its bounds. About 72 per cent. of the earth's surface is covered with water; and the average depth of the oceans is six or seven times the average height of the lands above sea level. Hence there is some fifteen times as much water below the sea level as there is dry land above it; and if the present dry land were to sink beneath the ocean, the level of the latter would be raised only a few hundred feet. While if all the inequalities of the globe could be smoothed out, so that its entire surface would be of a uniform level, the waters would cover it completely to a uniform depth of about 9,000 feet, or 1.56 miles.

To illustrate the matter in another way, let us suppose a circle 79 inches in diameter to be drawn on a blackboard, or such a segment of such a circle as can thus be shown. On a circle of this size, representing the earth, the highest mountains would appear as very slight and sharp protuberances .055 of an inch in height, and the depth of the ocean by a corresponding depression .06 of an inch in depth; while to represent the average height of the land would require something more precise than a clumsy piece of chalk, and the results of any of these deviations from the true circle would be indistinguishable across an ordinary room.

In view of all this, what an extremely slight disturbance of their delicate equilibrium would it require to spill the ocean over the land. Indeed, may we not class it as one of the perpetual miracles of nature that the ocean so obediently keeps within its bounds as it has done in modern times? "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no farther; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed."

But a broad view of the facts of geology gives us other reasons for believing in the reality of a world catastrophe which are immensely stronger than those local (almost trivial) evidences adduced by such authors as Howorth, Prestwich, Wright, and Suess; and to a consideration of these larger evidences we must presently direct our attention. Lack of space compels me to assume that my readers are more or less familiar with ordinary geological terms and elementary geological facts. And the outline way in which these facts must be presented compels me to refer the reader to my treatise on this subject,¹ where detailed evidence will be found for many facts here

¹The Fundamentals of Geology, 1913.

necessarily stated with what may appear like dogmatic bluntness.

Accordingly, we must next consider the series of facts which have induced many intelligent people to say that the fossil world, when studied as a whole, as a unity, presents some remarkable evidences of a great world catastrophe as probably the cause of a major part of the geological changes recorded in the stratified rocks—just how large a part, it may be difficult at present to say exactly.

VI

1. The fossils found in the stratified rocks are, as a rule, very abnormal in their abundance, for exceedingly few fossils are now being made in our modern world. They are also abnormal in their (generally) splendid preservation, mere fragments being about all that our modern world can show as materials for fossilization.

2. There is but one climate known to geology proper,¹ and this climate was astonishingly mild and warm over the entire globe.

The spring

Perpetual smiled on earth with verdant flowers.

But the elephants and other animals found frozen in the ice of northern Siberia are the best of contemporary vouchers that this climate was “abruptly terminated,” as Dana says, and became “suddenly extreme as of a single winter’s night.” Other considerations just as conclusively prove that this change of climate was not local, but world wide in extent.

3. When looked at broadly, the fossils are seen to be quite generally larger and better developed

¹As the so-called “glacial” phenomena are considerably later than the other deposits, they are not here included in what is termed “geology proper.”

than their nearest living representatives. And if we can hold *sub judice* the theory of successive geological "ages," until this point also can be considered, we shall think it very significant that this splendid development is characteristic of the fossils of all the various formations, and that when we cross over into our modern era, the change in the fossils is just as sudden and complete as is that of climate.

4. Deposits like those of the strata containing the fossils are not now being formed anywhere in our deep seas or oceans. The work of the Challenger expedition, with many subsequent investigations, has proved that in the deep ocean absolutely no true stratigraphical deposits are now being made. When we get out beyond the narrow continental shelf, from end to end over the whole ocean floor there is no gravel, no sand, no clay being shifted or deposited in modern times, nothing whatever to disturb the eternal calm of the silent waters. As Geikie remarks of the deposits now lying on the bottom of our modern ocean: "They have no analogues among the formations of the earth's crust;" that is, these modern deposits are distinctly different in mechanical make-up from those beds which compose our dry land, laid down in the ancient time, although these latter contain abundant remains of animals that once lived in the deep waters of the ocean.

5. Leading geologists, like Howorth and Suess, have critically examined the evidence supposed to indicate that gradual changes of land and sea level are now going on; and they have proved conclusively that *such alleged changes are not now in progress*. To quote the words of Suess himself: "The theory of the secular oscillations of the continents is not

*Textbook of Geology, ed. of 1903, p. 929.

competent to explain the repeated inundation and emergence of the land;" for even in those localities, like Sweden and Greenland, whose coasts have been supposed to be rising or falling, "displacements susceptible of measurement have not occurred within the historic period."

In short, this prince of modern geologists, after an exhaustive examination of the scientific literature of all civilized countries, thus writes the epitaph of the old theory of the gradual and continuous exchange of land and water: "Thus, as our knowledge becomes more exact, the less are we able to entertain those theories which are generally offered in explanation of the repeated inundation and emergence of the continents."

Thus on five separate counts we have evidence of the bankruptcy of the theory of uniformity as an explanation of how the geological changes took place; and if we presently find, on a study of the geological "ages," that these "ages" based on the fossils as time tickets are wholly mythical and unscientific, we shall not have to explain any "repeated" inundation and emergence of the continents, but can assign one major geological event as sufficient to explain the whole. For according to the familiar adage in logic known as Occam's razor, or the law of parsimony, no more causes are to be admitted than are sufficient to explain the phenomena.

VII

The history of how the theory of successive ages was first adopted from a few observations in Western Europe, on the childish assumption that the order of succession there found was an infallible gauge with

*Face of the Earth, Vol. II, pp. 540, 497.

²⁰*Op. cit.*, p. 295.

which to check up all other deposits found elsewhere, would furnish us with some instruction—possibly some diversion. A study of the *a priori* aspects of the theory, as to how its founders were so sure that no other deposits would ever be found subsequently on the other side of the globe contradicting their theory, would certainly furnish us with the diversion if not the instruction. But on both counts we should soon arrive at the conclusion that neither in its history nor in its logic can this theory of successive ages, based on the fossils as time tickets, stand investigation. But we must here pass to consider (again in mere outline) a series of five additional facts, which put out of court this theory of successive ages based on the supposed time value of the fossils.

1. In the earlier days of the theory of successive ages, it was taught that only certain kinds of fossils are ever found at the bottom of the series, or next to the Primitive or Archaean. This supposition was a survival of the onion-coat theory; and even after this absurd notion was professedly discarded, it was still confidently asserted that only one assemblage of low types of life prevailed around the entire globe in the “earliest” age. As Herbert Spencer admitted: “Though the onion-coat hypothesis is dead, its spirit is traceable, under a transcendental form, even in the conclusions of its antagonists.”

But it is now well known that the so-called “oldest” fossiliferous rocks occur only in detached patches over the globe, while in perhaps a majority of localities other or “younger” formations are just as likely to be found on the Primitive or next to the Archaean. Similarly, even the very “youngest” formations may be so metamorphosed and crystalline as to resemble

exactly in this respect the so-called "oldest" rocks. On the other hand, some of the very "oldest" rocks, may, like the Cambrian rocks around the Baltic and in various parts of the United States, consist of soft muds that are scarcely indurated and sands that are still incoherent.

All of which means, in plain language, that numerous facts regarding the *position* of the fossil-bearing strata, as well as regarding their outward *appearance of antiquity* based on their degree of consolidation, contradict the theory of successive ages, or of a definite age for each particular kind of fossil.

2. Many of the rivers of the world completely ignore the alleged varying ages of the strata in the different parts of their course, and treat them all alike as of the same age, or as if they began sawing at them all at the same time. This is true of the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Danube in Europe, the Sutlej of India, and the upper part of the Colorado in America, not to mention others. The old strand lines which encircle all the continents act in the very same way, ignoring the varying ages of the rocks they happen to encounter; as is also true of most of the great faults or fissures which are of more than local extent. The ore veins of the various mineral deposits are about as likely to be found in Tertiary or Mesozoic as in Paleozoic rocks. A similar lesson may be learned from the abundant fossils lying exposed on the deep ocean bottom, uncovered by subsequent deposits, for they are about as likely to be Paleozoic or Mesozoic as Tertiary.

From this series of facts we conclude that practically all the great natural chronometers of the earth seem to treat the various fossiliferous beds as if they

are *all of about the same age*, completely disregarding the alleged distinctions in age founded on the fossils.

3. Very many genera, often whole tribes, of animals are found as fossils only in the "oldest" rocks, and *have skipped all the rest*, though found in comparative abundance in our modern world. Many others have skipped from the Mesozoic down, while innumerable others skip large sections of the geological series.

These manifest absurdities would be easily avoided by acknowledging that the current distinctions as to the ages of the fossils are purely conventional and artificial, and that one fossil is intrinsically just as old or just as young as another, so far as science can tell us.

4. It is a common thing to find "young" beds of any formation in such *perfect conformability* on some of the very "oldest" beds over wide areas of country, that the vast interval of time alleged to be properly intervening is utterly unrepresented either by deposition or erosion; as if nature had closed shop or put an injunction on the action of the elements for a few million years, and everything had to continue in the *status quo* for this long interval, the waters neither wearing away nor building up over any part of this taboo ground for all this time. In many instances, too, these age-separated formations are so much alike in structure and in mineral make-up that, "were it not for fossil evidence, one would naturally think that a single formation was being dealt with" (McConnell); while these telltale conditions are "not merely local, but persistent over wide areas" (A. Geikie), so much so that the "numerous examples"

(Suess) of these anomalous conditions "may well be cause for astonishment" (Suess).

An even more illuminating fact, if possible, is that these conformable relations of incongruous strata are often *repeated over and over again* in the same vertical section, the same kind of anachronistic bed reappearing alternately with others of an entirely different "age," that is, repeatedly appearing "as if regularly interbedded" (A. Geikie) with them, in a manifestly undisturbed series of strata.

How can intelligent men face this set of tell-tale facts and still believe implicitly in the theory of a definite age for each particular or typical kind of fossil?

5. In very numerous instances, and over hundreds or even thousands of square miles, the perfectly conformable conditions spoken of in the preceding paragraphs are exactly reproduced *upside down*. This does not mean that the fossils or the individual beds are upside down, but the series or the order of the beds relative to one another. That is, very "old" rocks occur with just as much appearance of natural conformability on top of very "young" rocks, and with every physical appearance of having been actually deposited in this order so flatly contradicting the theory of successive ages. One of the largest areas of this character which have been examined carefully is in Alberta and Montana, extending some three hundred and fifty miles north and south, and having a width that can be traced by actual outcrops for at least twenty or thirty miles. In this area Algonkian or Pre-Cambrian strata lie on top of Cretaceous, while the line between them, in the words of a well-known Canadian geologist, "acts exactly like the line of

contact of two nearly horizontal formations," and in a natural section made by a river they "appear to succeed one another conformably."¹¹ In the Canadian part of this wonderful area, at about the 50th parallel, there are no less than five parallel mountain ranges composed of these Paleozoic rocks, with four intervening Cretaceous valleys, one of the latter being ninety-five miles long; while the famous Crow's Nest Mountain, Gould's Dome, and Chief Mountain are like Paleozoic islands floating on a Cretaceous sea.

A little farther to the south is another somewhat similar area, some two hundred and seventy miles long, covering parts of Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming. An example in the Appalachian Mountains of Tennessee and Georgia is three hundred and seventy-five miles long, while one in northern China is reported to be five hundred miles long. The many examples that might be adduced from the Alps and other European mountains would only help to show that practically every part of the globe that has been carefully examined has always furnished one or more examples of these astonishing conditions, Professor Albert Heim saying of parts of Switzerland that these conditions "are a universal phenomenon in the Northern and the Central Alps."¹²

In all these examples there is no question whatever among geologists as to the correct naming or classification of the strata involved, nor is there any dispute as to their perfectly normal physical appearance, Sir A. Geikie remarking of an example in Scotland: "Had these sections been planned for the purpose of deception, they could not have been more skilfully devised, * * * and no one coming first to this

¹¹Annual Report, 1886, Part D, p. 33f.

¹²*Der Bau der Schweizeralpen*, p. 17.

ground would suspect that what appears to be a normal stratigraphical sequence is not really so."¹³

Of course, the geologists have their "explanations" for these phenomena, explanations that have repeatedly changed during the few years in which the facts have been known, and that involve contortions of the crust of old Mother Earth more fabulous and incredible than have ever been charged against the theory of a universal deluge. But how much of the earth's surface would we have to find in an apparently normal condition, but with "older" beds on top and "younger" beds below, before geologists would be compelled to admit the possibility that they were really deposited in this order of sequence? But if they really were deposited in the order in which we find them, what becomes of the theory of life succession? Or what becomes of the whole theory of biological evolution?

VIII

But it is time to pause and take our bearings. In my opinion it does not require any great amount of preliminary scientific training to frame a safe and adequate generalization from the facts we have been studying. Too long has it been assumed that the interpretation of the general facts of geology is the exclusive prerogative of the geological specialist. On the contrary, men well trained in other lines of thinking are even better prepared than the geological specialist (already committed against it) to see the real meaning of the facts listed above. Hence, it is to this larger audience, the jury of enlightened public opinion, that I appeal with this apparently novel and revolutionary line of argument, believing that the average intelligent man who is accustomed to weigh

¹³Nature, November 13, 1884.

evidence will not brush this argument aside as unworthy of a moment's notice.

I am not indifferent to the objections to the idea of a universal flood, and that this flood should be regarded as the prime cause of a large part, an indefinitely large part, of the geological changes recorded in the stratified rocks. However, about all the objections hitherto presented may be included under the one head, viz., that such an explanation invokes a wholly supernatural event, or at least a far greater and more stupendous physical event than has ever come within the purview of scientific investigation. I realize that there are many minds so constituted by nature and training that to them such a supposition is utterly unthinkable; and I realize, too, that the number of such people has not diminished in modern times. Nevertheless, there are still a few who believe that the living God, the Creator, has at times done some surprising things in our world, phenomena being observed that natural science can never hope to measure or account for, and that we therefore in our limitations call "supernatural." People who continue to believe in the Incarnation, in the bodily resurrection of Jesus, not to mention the many deeds recorded of Jesus during His lifetime, will not lightly regard these modern scientific evidences confirming the record of the early chapters of Genesis, and tending to show their historicity in a more definite, literal fashion than has for many years been thought possible. And I have confidence that any open-minded man who will admit the possibility of a real universal Deluge cannot fail to be impressed with the force of the line of argument now available in favor of its actual occurrence.

Thus I hope at least to lift the doctrine of a universal Deluge out of the obscurity into which it has fallen for nearly a century, and to give it once more a respectable scientific standing as at least a possible hypothesis.

In reality, however, the problem of the recovery from such a world disaster is the real problem. Not how the waters of the ocean could be brought up over the lands by gigantic tidal waves or in some other mode of repeated recurrence, such as is indicated in the alternations of strata in almost every geological section the world over, but how the world could ever have recovered from such a catastrophe without almost another Creation—this is the real problem. But while the supposition of these two events, an awful world disaster and a most wonderful recovery from this disaster, may inspire us with awe and wonder it does not make such large drafts on our credulity, it does not so outrage our instinct for logic and clear thinking, as do the theories of the uniformitarians so long protected from inconvenient questioning under theegis of inductive science.

IX

Let us summarize what we have been considering in the foregoing pages.

In examining the geological aspects of the popular theories, we found that many prominent geologists admit some sort of partial catastrophe as having overtaken the world since Man appeared upon it.

Following this we learned how the various formations closely resemble one another in several remarkable and supremely important particulars. These facts emphasize the unity or solidarity of the fossil

world, showing how all its parts are indissolubly bound together in a common fate, and at the same time sharply and distinctly differentiating the ancient from our modern world by an impassable boundary line of world-wide geological changes that true science can never ignore. That is, these world-wide changes are incontestable proof of a world disaster of some kind, and this proof comes as strongly from one formation or from one type of life as from another.

Lastly, to set the seal to this demonstration of a world catastrophe, we have studied another series of five facts, five tremendous facts, which further prove the unity of the fossil world, and prove, if anything can be proved by stratigraphical evidence, that no one kind of fossil can be said to be older or younger than another. *The geological series is merely an old-time taxonomic series*, just as artificial and just as subject to rearrangement as is the modern taxonomic series; and a certain position in the one series does not represent a true time value any more than in the other.

Hence, as a world disaster of some dimensions has manifestly and admittedly overtaken our interdependent world of plants and animals, how are we going to limit definitely and strictly the work it did, saying that only a limited few of the superficial deposits, conveniently meager, were involved in its changes, and then calmly proceed, as if such a disaster had never happened, to tabulate all the other fossils off in single file, with their long thin line disappearing at the vanishing point of a past eternity, and expect to palm off the results of such methods on a credulous world as the consummate wisdom of inductive science?

In reality the science of geology as commonly

taught presents the most peculiar mixture of fact and nonsense to be found in the whole range of the natural sciences. In any minute study of a particular set of rocks in a particular locality, geology always follows facts and common sense, as the other sciences do; while in every general view of the fossil world as a whole, or in any correlation of the rocks of one region with those of another, it follows absurd, unscientific theories, as none of the other sciences do. But wherever it agrees with facts and common sense, it contradicts these absurd theories; and wherever it agrees with these theories it contradicts facts and common sense. In short, the popular method of arranging the fossils in a definite series representing alleged successive ages is merely an elaborate piece of scholarly nonsense. That it continues to be taught side by side with the other sciences, founded on the principles of Bacon and Newton, is a sad and instructive example of the effects of mental inertia and of the hypnotic influence of illustrious names.

THE REVIEW

GENERAL THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY

THE MOST SIGNIFICANT AND IMPORTANT EVENT THE RELIGIOUS world has seen in many years is the launching of the Interchurch World Movement. The initial step was taken last November, when Dr. Vance of Foreign Board of the Southern Presbyterian Church suggested to the executives of other foreign boards that they meet to consider a united movement. In December a conference, largely representative of the communions and missionary agencies of this country, met, and the movement began to take definite form. It is not to be confused with, nor regarded as a rival of, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. The Federal Council represents the churches as such, its constituent denominations having come into it through the action of their highest representative bodies, or judicatories. The Interchurch World Movement is simply the cooperation of the home and foreign boards of the churches and affiliated organizations for more adequate, efficient, and prompt action in the great fields wherein they already function. For the Federal Council to undertake this movement would require time for all its constituent bodies to act upon it, a matter of several years. The world situation is emergent, and the Interchurch World Movement, as at present contemplated, is an emergency arrangement to meet the tremendous needs of the hour. The harmony between the two organizations is evident from the fact that the personnel of their leadership is largely overlapping.

All ministers should acquaint themselves with this movement at once. As a leader of international prominence remarked to a friend at the Cleveland conference, this is the most important event in Christian history since the Reformation. In order to set forth the salient features of the Interchurch World Movement, we condense as follows information sent out by its publicity department:

“The first national Interboard Conference of the Interchurch World Movement, in which nearly 500 representatives of almost two hundred separate denominational and interdenominational,

missionary, educational and benevolent boards participated, met in Cleveland, Ohio, April 30—May 1, 1919. Seventy-six different denominations were represented. The Conference was called in order that the present plans of the Interchurch Movement might be laid before the delegates for advice and counsel. These plans were fully discussed and conclusions were reached of a character to permit of a fairly definite statement as to just where the Interchurch World Movement stands today.

"First in its program is the proposal for a complete survey of the missionary and benevolent work and responsibility of the American Protestant churches, both at home and abroad. The object of the survey will be to show exactly the preparedness, or unpreparedness, of the church as a whole and the denominations individually to grapple adequately with their whole task. The survey will include an examination both of the work now being done or contemplated and also the unoccupied fields both at home and abroad for which the church has a definite responsibility.

"The home survey will fall naturally into the divisions in which the various denominations are accustomed to regard their work. The comprehensiveness of this survey may be grasped by quoting from the report of the Committee on Findings which formally expressed the approval of the Conference to the plan:

"We understand that these surveys will not only cover those fields commonly classified as "missionary" but will include all evangelistic effort; the religious nurture of children; the enlistment and special preparation of youth for Life Service; the educational system of the churches at home and abroad—general, theological, vocational and professional; philanthropic institutions—hospitals, orphanages, asylums and child welfare agencies; the means for the support of the ministry in retirement, as well as in active service; and the contribution of the church to the solution of the definite social and industrial problems of the new day of readjustment and reconstruction."

"The foreign survey will include the total responsibility of the American Protestant churches for the entire world.

"The plans of both surveys are already approved and the work is under way. It is expected that these surveys will be the basis of the entire Interchurch World Movement program. They will make available for the first time in the history of Protestantism a sufficient amount of coördinated information to provide the basis for an adequate comprehension of the size and the difficulties of the Christian task, both as a problem in administration, and in the education of the Protestant constituency."

"By means of every available educational facility American Protestantism will be presented, according to a unified plan of campaign, with the exact facts with reference to its national and world responsibility.

"Upon the information which the surveys supply, a world program will be reconstructed. This program will consist of the separate national and world programs of the associated denominations so related to one another that unity of effort and of presentation to the churches may be achieved. It will be possible, not only for every individual church to know what its own part is in the program, but also to know what is the part of every other church. In view of the vast complexity of the problems to be studied and the vast distances involved, as well as for the sake of systematized effort, the program will be built, not on the basis of a single spasmodic effort for the immediate lifting of the work of the Christian church to its maximum high level, but on a five year basis. This will permit of the gradual setting up of the program with a view to efficiency and permanence. It is contemplated that at the end of the five year old period the church ought to have reached a plan of effort which is adequate to the eventual accomplishment of the church's full duty."

"One of the most important objects of the Interchurch World Movement is to stimulate an adequate enlistment of men and women in the service of Christ, not only to meet the present pressing needs for Christian workers, but also to undertake the new obligations which any complete survey of the task of the church will reveal. This campaign also will be unified with a view to the systematic and carefully directed presentation to the Christian young people of the nation of the unlimited opportunities for Life Service with its attendant blessings.

"In a similar way the work of the Sunday schools, of religious education in general and all the benevolent responsibilities of the church, will be surveyed and presented as a part of an adequate world program."

"Most important of all in the present proposed program of the Interchurch World Movement is the plan for unified evangelistic effort to accompany the call for Life Service and the presentation of the plans of the World program. There is being planned the most tremendous intensive spiritual cultivation of the various Christian churches working together according to a unified plan which Protestantism has ever seen. * * * Great emphasis will be placed upon the development of prayer life of the church and upon the enlistment of a great army of intercessors.

"Nothing so vast in the way of unified Christian effort has ever before been planned, much less undertaken. The issues of the war, more particularly the issues of peace, and the general conviction which found expression again and again in the addresses and in the discussion at Cleveland, point, however, to such new spiritual hunger within the American church and such a new desire for effective action that many of the difficulties seem already eliminated. Apathy is disappearing and there is an

insistent desire throughout the nation that the American Christian come forward with a plan of leadership and with a program which will be adequate to the new day."

WHEN THE SECULAR PRESS CONTAINS AN APPEAL TO THE church to exert itself to help the world, or to men to seek God and His righteousness, there is somehow the implication that the world is becoming a bit uneasy over its own state. A noteworthy instance of the kind is an article by Alfred Noyes, in *The Saturday Evening Post* of April 12, under the caption, *Civilization Imperiled*. It is worth while to quote several passages:

"Only the irresponsible and thoughtless are unconscious of a vast peril to that slow growth of the ages which we call our civilization. Practical men, with their feet planted solidly on the earth, are looking into the future as into an immeasurable darkness; and they are not sure whether there is solid ground in front of them or whether the next few steps may bring them to the brink of a precipice."

"It has been said that the war was fought to make the world safe for democracy. It has also been said that it was fought to make democracy safe for the world. But both of these aims are included and made one in the fundamental aim of reasserting the rule of right. A right democracy will be safe for the world; and a right doing, right thinking world will be safe for democracy. Democracy and freedom depend upon the establishment of justice and a law before which all men are equal.

"They have nothing in common with the insane leveling process which would reduce the hill to the plain or cut off the feet of the tall man to make him equal to the short. Unless Nature herself is abolished we must follow the universal laws of Nature. Fire will continue to burn the hand that defies it; and it is only by our observance of law that we live.

"The law is our only pathway through chaos; and as the old Scripture said, 'Thy word is a lantern unto my feet.' In the moral world this is equally true. The soul of humanity cannot live without religion; and our only hope is that mankind may now return to the first four words of the Bible: 'In the beginning God.'"

"A quarter of a century ago all the creeds went into the melting pot; and there are very few among the political or 'intellectual' leaders in Europe to-day who would describe themselves in private as anything but complete agnostics with regard to the eternal foundations of justice and right."

"The greater part of the world has lost its religious sense, lost its sense of the ties which bind men to one another and to the Eternal in an interdependent harmony. The direct results

of this loss are accumulating daily in the general lack of confidence in the pledged word and the growing contempt for all the codes of right and wrong."

"Attacks upon certain religious dogmas and traditions have developed into something like a dismissal of the first postulates and axioms of a sane existence, one of which is that the greater cannot be produced by the less. We have developed a system of explanations of the universe which are in direct contradiction of this first postulate. We explain man by something less, and that again by something less, until we have whittled away all things visible or invisible. We have deliberately taught ourselves to look downward into nothingness, though true science and true reason and every natural instinct of religion would teach us to look upward to the ever-expanding heavens and the infinite power of God.

"It is a direct result of this abandonment of the very foundations of thought that the world should be bewildered by its own growing insanity. The 'ugly face' of the thing which the President of the United States discerned in the German Kultur has been moping and mowing at us in every evil shape of the pit; from the walls of picture galleries; from the stage of the opera, where the most degenerate creation of the most depraved of Irish decadents, the Salome of Oscar Wilde, has been glorified with German music and has wriggled and leered over her dish of blood at the jaded representatives of a civilization too exhausted to respond to any higher appeal."

"It must cease to be below the intellectual dignity of the modern thinker to concern himself with the great central facts of Christianity. Germany has demonstrated to the entire world that the philosophy of the sword and of self-aggrandizement is a complete failure in the present stage of civilization. There was a time, in the jungle, when sheer brute force was dominant. Even then it was tempered by the mother love of the wild beast. There came a moment in the history of man when it was necessary for him to take a step higher in the universe than had been attained by any creatures of the jungle; a moment when it became necessary that in order to save his life he should reverse the rule of primitive Nature and lose it.

"That moment was the birth of Christ and the foundation of the profoundest religion and philosophy that the world has ever known. Germany has failed to overthrow it and plunge us back into the pre-Christian era. The time has now come for the combined forces of Christianity to reassert their divine creed and bring healing to a wounded world. May all the power and idealism of the great republic move behind this new crusade and lift its glorious symbol to complete victory again!"

OUR NATION IS PROVIDENTIALLY FREE FROM THE BURDEN AND hindrance of a state church, but it has been declared, very properly, to be a Christian nation, in the sense of standing for the principles of Christianity as distinct from non-Christian religions and anti-Christian propaganda. It is always gratifying to find a government official proceeding upon this principle with no apology, compromise or sop thrown to the forces that antagonize religious faith and seek to abolish our general Christian institutions. The Secretary of the Navy deserves credit for his straightforward stand on the Sabbath question, indicated by General Order No. 456, as below:

"OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH DAY

"In order to insure a proper observance of the Lord's Day in the Navy of the United States, and to provide the officers and men with rest and recreation so essential to efficiency, the following order will be carried out:

"Hereafter all commanding officers and others officially concerned will see to it that aboard ships and on shore stations to which they are attached, no work of any character whatsoever is performed except works of necessity.

"This order will be construed as embracing target practice and drills of every character, inspection of ship and crew, clothing inspection, issuing of small stores, and all other ship activities that violate the letter and spirit of this order.

"No vessel of the Navy shall begin a cruise on Sunday except in case of emergency.

"In order to insure the regular performance of divine services aboard the vessels of the U. S. Navy, and at shore stations, it is further ordered that in no instance shall secular work be allowed to interfere with the holding of divine services, and that every possible assistance and encouragement be given our chaplains in the conduct of such services. A suitable compartment or room shall be designated for this purpose, and properly rigged for the occasion, and orderly quiet be maintained throughout the ship during divine services. The ship's band shall always be made available for use at divine service.

"When there is no chaplain attached to his ship or station, the commanding officer will arrange for and give every possible assistance to any naval chaplain in squadron, or adjacent, or available who might be able to come aboard for such purpose. In case it is impossible to secure the services of a regular Navy Chaplain, it is directed that commanding officers, when prac-

licable, invite competent clergymen from ashore to come aboard and conduct religious services.

"JOSEPHUS DANIELS,

"Secretary of the Navy."

THE HISTORY OF A WAR CANNOT BE WRITTEN AS SOON AS THE last shot is fired, any more than we can hope for impartial judgment while battles still rage. However, when there is no longer the necessity for great secrecy and when communication between the belligerent peoples is once more established, facts not before known to the public begin to come to light. One might speculate with interest upon the array of documentary and other evidence the historian of fifty years hence will have before him as he essays the task of a just estimate of the past five years. One point of importance will be the attitude of the Vatican. Indeed, the discussion of this question has already opened. After contrasting the attitude of the present Pope with the disposition of his predecessors of "the Heroic Age of the Papacy," a writer in *The Contemporary Review* for March, 1919, goes on to say, concerning the neutrality of the Vatican:

"But the 'neutrality' of the Vatican was a pretext. The remarkable articles which appeared in the *Revue de Paris* (October 15th and November 1st, 1918) under the title of 'La Politique de Benoit XV.' make it clear that Rome was not neutral. The Pope was an active ally of the Central Powers; and must share in whatever obloquy attaches to them by reason of their inception and conduct of the war."

"The conclusions at which the writer in the *Revue de Paris*—whose name is an open secret—arrives, and which he justifies not only by direct appeal to documents, but by that indirect and cumulative evidence (not to be confounded with hearsay) which is derived from personal knowledge of the men and the milieu, is:—

"1. That the Pope, being determined to regard the war as no more than a vulgar rivalry of ambitions, refused from the first to admit the criminality of the violation of Belgian neutrality; and would not allow either that the Allies had any advantage over their opponents in the matter of justice, or that the methods of war adopted by Germany differed morally from theirs.

"2. That, in consequence, as he considered our ambitions more dangerous and more tenacious than those of Germany, he did not scruple to urge the United States to prohibit the exportation of arms and munitions of war; and to use his influence, not

only with neutrals to dissuade them from joining the Allies, but over Catholics in the Allied countries to induce them to break up the alliance, and to detach themselves from the common bond.'

"Whether this was right or wrong is matter of opinion. But it is matter of fact that it went beyond neutrality. To act in this way was to take an active part for the one and against the other side."

"It is well, indeed, that no representative of the Pope should sit at the Peace Conference; and that what was once known as the Roman question should rest in its dishonoured grave. But that what is, after all, the greatest of the Christian Churches should be weakened—and the Papacy is so closely identical with the Latin Church that what is loss to the one is loss also to the other—this is not matter for congratulation. The moral forces at the disposition of mankind are neither so many nor so strong that we can afford to see the disappearance of what was once one of them with indifference:

"Men are we, and must grieve when even the Shade

Of that which once was great is passed away.'

"To those who take the Ultramontane view of the Papacy the situation must be embarrassing. For it is not a matter of human frailty. If it were, it would be explicable: men are men. But Benedict XV. is neither an Alexander VI. nor a Julius II.: he is personally a virtuous, a benevolent, and a humane man. It would be unjust to suppose him indifferent to suffering, careless either of the horrors of war or of the interests of peace. He has done much—more probably than appears on the surface—to alleviate distress, to ameliorate the lot of prisoners, and to relieve strain. But, when a man assumes the part of God, that is not enough. The gravamen against him is not that he was wanting in humanity—this was not the case; but that he fell so lamentably short of any, even the loosest, conception of what the Vicar of Christ and the Vice-Gerent of Deity should be. The impossible is not to be expected: God did not, the Pope could not, 'stop the war.' But, were he what he claims to be, he would apprehend moral issues, discern the quality of human action, test the respective values of conflicting ideas. He would refrain from men of blood—'O my soul, come not thou into their secret!'; he would expose falsehood, rebuke oppression, denounce crime. He might have done these things; and he did not. 'When thou sawest a thief, thou consentedst unto him.' This is the tragedy of his reign; the bankruptcy of his office; the refutation of the conception of religion for which he stands."

IF THE SUBJOINED ITEM, QUOTED FROM THE NATION, APRIL 5, is correct, it would appear that the revolutionary spirit that is so profoundly moving Europe has invaded even the Catholic

Church. It is a common weakness of observers of the times to generalize upon insufficient evidence, and it may easily be that this action of the Czecho-Slovak priests will prove merely local and amount to little as reforms go, but it is significant of a changing mood at least. The paragraph referred to reads:

"A meeting was held at Prague on January 23 at which 475 Czecho-Slovak members of the Catholic priesthood demanded far-reaching reforms in the canonical law, chief among which were the abolition of the rights of patronage; the election of bishops by the clergy and the members of the church; the use of the mother tongue in the service and ceremonies of the church; the revocation of the celibacy law for priests and bishops; the democratizing of consistories and vicariates; and the annulment of the rule compelling priests to be clean-shaven and to wear the clerical collar. (In addition to those attending the meeting, 744 priests are said to have declared in favor of these reforms, while only fifty-five declared against them.)"

THE INCREASING TIME DEMANDED BY THE SCIENCES AND other vocational studies in modern education is compelling the study of Greek to fight hard for its place among the prime requisites of a liberal education, as the following paragraph would indicate:

"By a vote of 123 to 63, in the Congregation of the University of Oxford, a statute exempting candidates for Responsions from compulsory Greek was recently passed. Among those who voted for it was Dr. Gilbert Murray, Regius Professor of Greek in the university, who said that the attempt to keep up classical study by compulsion had met with constantly diminishing success. The system had failed, and they would have to abolish it. A protest against the proposed statute had previously been signed by several prominent teachers and officials of the university, pointing out that 'if candidates are not required to offer Greek in our first examination, Greek teaching in many smaller schools must perish. It is Oxford, and Oxford alone, which so far saves it from extinction.' The signers indignantly repudiate the plea of practical utility. 'We are told,' they say, 'that the matter is prejudged already. Cambridge has already made Greek optional in her first examination; we must copy Cambridge or see our clientèle leaving us for a university which will sell its wares cheaper.' 'This view,' they add, 'that if we maintain our traditions we will empty our colleges, is not at all complimentary to the University of Oxford.'"

IF WE ARE TEMPTED TO THINK THAT THE FORMER DAYS WERE better than these, in the matter of higher education, we may reflect upon such experiences as Brander Matthews relates, in *These Many Years*, concerning his life as a student of Columbia College, which he entered in 1868. After referring to the extreme youth and boisterousness of the undergraduates he speaks in this way of the lifeless, mechanical type of instruction imparted:

"We were expected to prepare so many lines of Latin and Greek, or so many problems in mathematics, or so many pages of the text-book in logic or in political economy; and in the classroom we were severally called upon to disgorge this undigested information. And it was information that we were expected to acquire, rather than the ability to turn this to account and to think for ourselves.

"We were rarely encouraged to go outside the text-book; and no collateral reading was either required or suggested. We were not urged to use the library; indeed it might be asserted that any utilization of its few books was almost discouraged. The library was open only for one or two hours a day, after one o'clock when most of us had gone home to our luncheons."

"Professor Lounsbury once told me that during his student career at Yale, a little more than ten years earlier than mine at Columbia, he never heard mention of any English author. In the decade that divided us the world had moved at least a little; and we had one term in the history of English literature. But we were not introduced to the actual writings of any of the authors, nor was any hint dropped that we might possibly be benefited by reading them for ourselves."

"I think, although I am not at all certain, that I must have had a course in philosophy, but if I did it left no trace, and it imparted no mental training. I do not suppose that the instruction was inferior at Columbia then to what it was in most of the other small colleges; in fact, I am inclined to believe that it was on the whole superior. Yet I have always regretted that I did not come under a teacher who might have imparted to me a realizing sense of the meaning and the value of philosophy, who might have opened my mind and taught me how to think."

BOOKS

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHURCH AND MINISTRY¹

Corresponding to the two books by different authors which he edited, *Essays on Some Theological Questions of the Day* (1905)

¹*Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry, by Various Writers. Edited by H. B. Swete, D.D., New York and London, 1918, Pp. XX+446.*

and Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day (1909), Dr. Henry Barclay Swete, Regius Professor of Divinity in Cambridge (died May 10, 1917), edited another portly volume, which he saw in proof but not in final form. The essays are: A. J. Mason, Conceptions of the Church in Early Times (56pp.); J. A. Robinson, The Christian Ministry in the Apostolic and Sub-Apostolic Periods (35pp.); C. H. Turner, Apostolic Succession: A. The Original Conception, B. The Problem of Non-Catholic Orders (121pp.); J. M. Bernard, The Cyprianic Doctrine of the Ministry (47pp.); W. H. Frere, Early Forms of Ordination (49pp.); F. E. Brightman, Terms of Communion and the Ministration of the Sacraments in Early Times (95pp.). There are 38 pages of indexes, which are a delight to the studious reader's soul.

It is unnecessary to say that the writers are among the most eminent scholars of the Church of England, sound in their learning and their churchmanship, though they are high churchmen first and scholars next. Therefore the value of the essays is in their inverse order, that is, their distance in times and subjects treated from the Apostolic Age, their nearness to questions of simple history disentangled from controversy between disputants on primitive church polity. Even when in later times controversial points occur, the authors generally take the conventional High Church view, as for instance on the presbyterial consecrations in Alexandria, of which there is ample witness. Even so, the scholarly equipment of the book is so large, that it is one of the most instructive and valuable in the voluminous literature of its subject. If it has not superseded older books, like Lightfoot's famous dissertation (on which see Faulkner in *The Methodist Review*, July, 1914, 622ff.), Hatch on the Organization of the Early Christian Churches, Harnack's and Schaff's editions of the *Didache*, Harnack on the Constitution of the Early Church, and Lindsay's *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries* (compare the two American books on the Historic Episcopate by R. E. Thompson and R. J. Cooke), it will remain an indispensable companion to them. I venture a few comments or corrections.

"If as Sohme argues, Catholicism consists in treating the visible fellowship of believers as the true Church of Christ then the apostles were Catholics" (p.22). This is misleading on account

of the different meanings of the word Catholic. There is no church so Low as not to believe that the visible fellowship of believers is the true church of Christ. "Father Tyrrell (Life, ii. 62) appears to mean much the same [as the point just quoted] when he makes the main difference between Catholicism and Protestantism to consist in believing or denying the divine origin of the Church" (p.22, note 4). Whereas all the main bodies of Protestants believe thoroughly in the divine origin of the church. "However large a liberty of local development was allowed to churches by the apostolic founders, the liberty was bounded by a sense of duty not only to the founder himself, but to the rest of Christendom" (p.23). Very true, but some churches were not founded by apostles, and whether so founded or not, they were absolutely independent of each other, except as bound together by visits of prophets and apostles, by a common faith and love, by contributions and letters. "It is doubtful whether the *Doctrine [Teaching] of the Twelve Apostles* is a transcript from the life of any actual Christian community" (p.23). Its circumstantial details and matter-of-fact prescriptions make it certain that it is one of the documents nearest actual conditions of any that have come down to us from, say, 100-125.

On page 28 there are misconceptions of both Luther and Montanists. The latter did not attempt to "overthrow" what the author calls the "Catholic Church," but only to align the church of their time with what they thought was apostolic Christianity. Though "to acknowledge the prophet" was a test of Montanism, to reject the bishop was not. The Montanists revived the apostolic emphasis on prophets, and only so far reacted against the emphasis on bishops of 150-200. On account of the seething heresies of the Gnostics in Asia Minor at about 117, and the consequent necessity of keeping the Christians in constant touch with their bishop, who by this time as distinct from presbyter had been put in in some Asiatic churches, it is true that the prophet-bishop Ignatius "spake with the voice of God" to the Christians at Philadelphia: "Pay heed to the bishop, and to the presbytery and the deacons"; but it is a very large and very risky inference from this one instance to conclude that the "development of the Christian hierarchy was in great measure due to the exhortations of Christian prophets, speaking by the word of the Lord and in the Spirit" (p.30). Besides, if that had been true,

the so-called "hierarchy" (which is a misleading word for the ministry of the second century) would not have been so anxious to suppress the prophets. "The Roman Church in the first century (97) believed that the foundation of the hierarchy was due to the instructions received from Christ by his apostles (Clem. Rom. 42, 44)" (p.30, note 2). But Clement says no such thing. The general principle of order (as over against anarchy and insubordination) he carries back to God and Christ in section 42, and in 44 he says that the apostles knew through Christ that there would be strife over the name of the bishops' office, or, as it should properly be translated, over the name of the oversight, where "name" is used in the sense of nature, or the thing itself, and which passage probably refers to Matthew 20: 20-28. Having this foreknowledge, says Clement of Rome, the apostles saw that "approved men" should succeed in regular fashion to "ministration." The Roman Church speaks of no "instructions."

There is fallacy in the use of "ordination" on pp. 30-31 and elsewhere, as in other words in our too ecclesiastically dominated Authorized Version. What we know as ordination was simply appointment in apostolic times, the laying on of hands being no necessary part of it, and when it was a part of it, being merely a symbol of blessing. What we mean by ordination, the making of a layman into a clergyman, or (in so-called Catholic Churches) into a priest, was unknown in the New Testament. We must also remember the constant interchange or synonymous use of symbol and reality in oriental speech ("be baptized and wash away thy sins"). Paul does not mean at all that Timothy received spiritual illumination through his hands (2 Tim. 1:6), but that the gift not of Paul but of God which is in thee (as a permanent possession, notice the present), was brought home to thy consciousness in dramatic fashion through the laying on of my hands. 1 Tim. 5:22 is not ordination in any sense, but is to be interpreted by the context and by 3:3.

"In the course of time [yes, a long time, say a hundred or two hundred years], the management of discipline passes entirely into the hands of the bishops. It is their business to exclude from communion and to readmit to it" (p.41), and a note is added, "see 3 John 10." Did Whately's Logic call that the fallacy of reference or of the footnote? Third John 10 says nothing

of the bishop's power, or anybody else's, to exclude from communion or to readmit to it. Not only so, there is not the slightest evidence in the New Testament that any church officer as such had power of that kind, and when like matters are alluded to, it is always the whole church which is addressed. The effort to build up prelatic authority on 2 Corinthians 10:8; 13:10 (p.42), even granting that because apostles had authority therefore bishops have it, breaks on Paul's own words which limit his authority to "building up," to moral and spiritual edification. The words, "feed my sheep" do not refer to authority in the ordinary sense nor to rule, for the simile of sheep cannot be pressed, but to spiritual feeding alone; as though Christ said: Build up my flock in my spirit, in my love and truth and power, so that they will not deny me as you have done. (The translation rule, ruler, etc., as to church leaders in the King James version is another instance of its animus.) The idea in the first essay of a kind of hierarchical rule in New Testament times is a fiction.

Another fallacy of the footnote as well as a more serious fallacy is on p. 45, where, after quoting Titus 1:9 (not "to the word which is faithful according to the doctrine," but "to the faithful word according to the teaching"), the writer adds: "Already the tremendous word [heretic] is known which is to designate the opponents of this sound teaching," and then quotes a verse three chapters beyond (3:10, 11). If you did not study the footnotes you would suppose that the apostle was really referring to the teaching of 1:9 (where "sound doctrine" should be "healthful teaching"). The "tremendous word," heretic or heresy, in the New Testament never means the "tremendous" thing which it came to mean in later church history, but always means a factious man, factions. "It [the apostolic church] had an organized hierarchy for worship and for," etc. (p.56), whereas even in the great epistles to the Corinthians there is not only not the slightest trace of so modest an officer as the presbyter or even the deacon, but the whole historical situation presupposes their absence. "The Church was Catholic from the outset" (p.56), is true only in the sense that it was an external brotherhood of saints. The sentence, "from the first the apostles held a supremely authoritative position" (p.77), is true and not true, and reveals a sad lack in books similar to this, viz., the need of a scientific, thorough,

candid canvass of the position of apostle in the early church, such, for instance, as Harnack gave in his edition of the *Didache*, and as Haupt gave in his suggestive and interesting treatise, *Zum Verständnis des Apostolats im Neuen Testament*, Halle, 1896.

When it is said that it is "mischievous" to think that prophets in the New Testament were "persons of authority" (p.77), that depends upon what you mean by authority. If you mean a religious preëminence spontaneously accorded to those who spake directly from God, then they had it, and it is not mischievous to think according to the facts; if you mean an authority as a kind of monarchical rule then they did not have it, nor the apostles either. Not even the *Didache* accords to prophets or apostles anything like prelatic oversight. This essay misconceives the view of those scholars who have given the prophet his true place according to ancient documents.

I fear I have transgressed the limits assigned for this review, and yet I have noticed only part of the points which I have marked as suggesting comment or correction.

JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER

THE COMING OF THE LORD²

Dr. Snowden's book is one of the fairest and ablest contributions to the postmillenarian literature. It is clear in style, temperate in spirit, and interesting in its mode of treatment. His examination of premillenarian teachings is limited to the views of one school, which holds to "the Rapture" and associated events. He overlooks altogether the views of the school of which Dr. Grattan Guinness was an able leader and exponent.

After a brief sketch of the history of the millennial hope and a chapter on some principles of Scripture interpretation, the author enters upon his argument. His first line of discussion relates to the Kingdom of God, which he calls "the key to the question of the coming of the Lord." He considers its nature and takes issue with all premillenarians who locate the Kingdom altogether in the future.

The growth of the Kingdom is the topic of another chapter, where he seeks to show that it "is not an institution that could be set up all at once by some sudden stroke of cosmic power," but

²The Coming of the Lord, by James H. Snowden, D.D., LL.D., New York, 1919. Pp. 288.

"a psychological organism that can be produced only by a gradual process" (p.72). He appeals to the four parables in Matthew 13 and one in Mark 4, which "compare the kingdom of heaven to processes of growth" (p.72). The mustard seed and the leaven are particularly stressed as showing that it is "a growth and not a cataclysm," "an unfolding seed and not exploding dynamite" (p.74). The question, whether it might not be both and is not described as both in our Lord's teachings, is touched upon later.

The present slow progress of the Kingdom the author regards as in no way discouraging or surprising when measured against the long foreground of the future as given by modern scientific expectations of "another hundred million years" ahead of us. Hints of this are found in the parable of the Talents with its suggestion of the "long time" after which the lord comes and makes a reckoning, and in the Great Commission which bids us make disciples of all the nations and baptize them—a work which Dr. Snowden says "will necessarily consume time that will be measured by millenniums" (p.81). This gradual growth is "attended with catastrophic crises" (p.81f). The author mentions the Captivity and Exile, the first coming of Christ with its critical events, Pentecost and other epochal events, and declares that "the second coming of Christ is in line with these crises and is the final catastrophic event in the earthly history of the kingdom of God" (p.85). In support of this, he appeals to the parables of the Tares and of the Net, to the Great Commission and to 1 Corinthians 15:24.

We cannot discover here or anywhere else in the work a fair recognition and adequate treatment of the rationale of the premillenarian position, that the great catastrophic event is not the final one, but like the others, an epochal event introducing a great era, the greatest era in the earthly history of the Kingdom. In fact, in the next chapter, on means of establishment of the Kingdom, the author, in an argument to show that it cannot be set up "by worldly means," attributes to the premillenarian scheme a belief in such means. "An outburst of supernatural power is to effect what the Gospel has failed to do" (p.87). He declares that the "modern premillenarian hope of a kingdom of God established by physical power is as unscriptural as it is unethical and unpsychological" (p.91). He shows that spiritual

agencies of truth and grace are the only means fitted and adequate to establish God's Kingdom and stresses the work of the Holy Spirit, the influence of a godly and faithful church, and the providential use of secular agencies. He makes the Great Commission the real cornerstone of his Biblical argument for the gradual spread of Christianity in the present age and by the present agencies until the world is thoroughly Christianized and a Kingdom of God is established—the equivalent of the millennium in its popular use.

He repudiates the premillenarian contention that our Lord's words: "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness," imply no more than the evangelization of all nations until a redeemed body is called out; and he seeks to show that the term "make disciples" (Matt. 28:19) involves actual conversion of all nations into disciples and not the discipling of some out of the nations. He appeals to Acts 14:21 where Paul and Barnabas "discipled many," as showing that the word is the equivalent of "convert," and that therefore our Lord's command is virtually a pledge that the preaching of the Gospel will result in the conversion of the world in this age (pp.99-103). This passage he regards as "an insurmountable rock" confronting the premillenarians and charges that in their discussions they treat it with "strange silence" (p.108f).

One weakness in the line of argument as to the means of establishing the Kingdom arises from the author's admission that great catastrophic events have been in the past means of introducing new and better stages of the Kingdom (pp.81-85). So on pages 92, 93, he says: "The sword with other forms of physical force, then, has a place in the work of the kingdom. * * * It can only clear a way for the kingdom but cannot create the kingdom itself." "The sword has ever had a place in clearing the world of injustice and oppression and thereby opening the way for the coming of the kingdom of God." These and other concessions are all that any premillenarian will ask as answer to Dr. Snowden's charge that they expect the Kingdom to be set up by physical power when Christ comes to set up His Kingdom and "his supernatural might shall be exerted in behalf of this kingdom in the most astonishing manner" (p.94), and in answer to his argument (p.117), that, "as the bodily presence of Jesus did not have any converting power in itself during his earthly

ministry, so it would not have any such power if he were again on earth." When he asks: "What place or need is there for these physical events?" (p.153), *i.e.*, the events attending the Lord's coming, the premillenarian will reply—their best literature seems to us to reply—that there is just such place and need as for the physical events that attended the first coming.

Dr. Snowden admits that such historical facts open the way for the coming of the Kingdom of God, in its development at various periods. So events at the second coming may, in a perfectly psychological and rational way, open the way for the later and grander age when the Kingdom is established triumphantly in all the nations. All evangelical premillenarians (and nearly all of them are evangelical) hold that no man in any age is converted except by the work of the Holy Spirit and the influence of divine truth; but they believe that providential happenings often serve as the occasion for the more potent operation of these spiritual forces, and that as our Lord's first coming and Pentecost with their external facts released in new forms and degrees the power of this Spirit of God, so the events attending the second coming will release as never before in the history of redemption the spiritual agencies that are vital and essential to man's regeneration.

One chapter is devoted to the various meanings of the term "Coming of the Lord." Another argues that the premillenarian view of "watching for the coming" is not in accordance with the sense in which the Scriptures use that term, inasmuch as "watching is working," working for it "by attending to our business" (pp.167, 240). The author devotes a chapter to Revelation 20:4-6, interpreting "the thousand years" as meaning the present Christian age and "the first resurrection" as meaning that the souls of the redeemed are "raised to the heavenly life where they reign with Christ as he rules in his kingdom on earth" during "the present dispensation" (p.181). "The statement that 'the rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years should be finished' refers to the general resurrection at the end of the world" (p.184). This reviewer will not undertake to show just what this difficult passage does mean. But, despite some great names with which Dr. Snowden backs up his view, we venture to suggest that an interpretation which makes "the rest of the dead" mean all the dead, including those from whom they are distinguished,

and which assigns to the word "lived" (the common factor in both equations) two utterly dissimilar meanings in the same sentence, is a feat in exegesis comparable only to the fallacy of the undistributed middle in logic.

The author's strongest and most effective work is in the line of exposing the weakness and crudities of much of the interpretation of Scripture current in certain premillenarian writings. We agree cordially with his repudiation of such lawless and impossible interpretations, and feel sure that they have done much to hinder the progress of a sane and moderate premillennial view among the evangelical churches. On the other hand, we think that the author follows some very precarious methods in his own exegetical work; and we cannot resist the impression that he is more at home in the field of psychology, more familiar with his material and authorities and more sure-footed in his methods there, than in the fields of criticism and hermeneutics. His assignment of Daniel to the late period of the second century B.C. will not invite the confidence of conservative readers, or help to strengthen his case with those who regard such a dating of the book as making it useless for argument as to the teaching of Scripture.

We pass over his statements as to the "physical impossibility" of the coming of Christ in the clouds so that every eye could see him (p.149f), and as to the argument of Paul on the resurrection as showing that our bodies will not be raised out of the grave as "physical organisms" (p.152). His treatment of 2 Thessalonians 2 is not as thorough as one would expect in a work of this character. The author seems to treat that highly important passage as lightly and inadequately as he complains that the opposing school treats the Great Commission. The statement (p.17) that "Paul in his earlier letters (First and Second Thessalonians) expected to be alive when Christ came" is a possible but not a necessary construction of the Apostle's language.

The statement, that "the entire weight of scholarship as represented by such authoritative works as *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, *The International Critical Commentary*, *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*, and *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, is against" the premillenarian view (p.244), raises the question whether these authorities do not take the position that Paul and the apostolic church taught and expected the return of Christ in the

near future, but proved to be mistaken. Dr. Snowden (p.17) ascribes that expectation to the early Christians. Do these authorities, does Dr. Snowden, accept the Pauline teaching as infallible and authoritative, or as mistaken and unreliable? If the latter, then why waste valuable time in discussing what the New Testament teaches on the subject?

We are glad to read any fresh and earnest treatment of this great doctrine. The silence of our pulpits on a theme so emphasized in the New Testament writings cannot be excused. It holds a central place in Scripture and should enrich and illumine our thought and testimony today.

WILLIAM HOGE MARQUESS.

THE ITALIANS IN AMERICA³

This little volume enjoys the distinction of being written by a working Italian missionary, and it gives the result of personal observations and interesting experiences which he has gathered during nearly ten years of labor in many Italian colonies of the United States. At the present time he is in charge of the Italian Episcopal Chapel connected with old Christ Church in Boston, Massachusetts. Previously he has been working under the auspices of the Presbyterian Church in Kansas City, in Wilmington, Delaware, and in Pennsylvania. He obtained his early education in Italy, and holds the degree of M.A. from the University of Pennsylvania. He is also one of the first two graduates of the Italian Theological Department of the Bible Teachers Training School. Dean Hodges, in his introduction, says: "Mr. Sartorio knows the Italian people by nature and by long and intimate acquaintance, and he knows the American people by wise observation and by the fortunate experience of illuminating friendships. Thus he stands in a position which fits him for the important work of interpretation."

The five chapters of the book discuss the following subjects: Life in the Italian Colonies, Americanization, The Religion of the Italians, Churches and Missions in America, American Leadership. On every one of these topics the author makes interesting remarks and suggestions, which are very familiar to the

³Social and Religious Life of Italians in America, by Rev. Enrico C. Sartorio, M.A., Boston, 1918. Pp. 149.

Italian Protestant ministers in general but which will probably appear quite new to most American readers familiar with the books written on the subject by so-called "experts." Mr. Sartorio begins by giving us a general description of his field of investigation as follows:

Out of an average of 800,000 Italians who came annually to America previous to the war less than 40,000 were Northern Italians; the rest were from Southern Italy. As is shown in the United States Report on Immigration, ninety-six per cent. are classified as unskilled laborers. The author observes that this classification is incorrect because all such laborers "are as a rule good tillers of the soil, know a great deal about farming, and, if the difficulties of the English language and the lack of funds did not hinder them, would make splendid farmers." He also defines what he means by "Italians," declaring: "I mean the large number of *Southern* Italian peasants which constitute the mass of my countrymen in America."

Eighty-four per cent. of the Italians coming here belong to the working age and are producers. At the age of eighteen each has cost his country, at the very lowest estimate, \$1,000 to bring him up. Italy spends a thousand dollars to bring him up, and then America reaps the profits of the investment. They crowd into the big American cities, men who have almost never seen a city, and they build their villages with their "imported" doctors, priests, bankers, etc. The life they live is not an easy one. They perform the duties that the slaves performed in ancient Rome. The more thrifty succeed, in a few years, in opening a grocery store or a saloon. They are isolated from the rest of the American world by what may be called the instinct of self-preservation. They know that as soon as they step outside of the Italian colony they are as helpless as babies, owing to their lack of knowledge of the language, customs, and laws of this country, and so they prefer the life of the slums, rather than the beauty of the country and nature to which they were used in Italy—anything rather than to be separated from the rest of their countrymen. In their native villages the Italian family often slept crowded into one room, but they did not really live there, as they are compelled to do here by the bitter climate. They were there just for a few hours during the cool, short Italian nights, and they think they can do the same here without any harm.

In Italy they know the difference between a peasant who has lived there always and one who has spent a few years in America and then gone back. "The former is poorer, but the latter is quite often rotten." "I am not blaming America as a nation," says the author. "That it is a free country, a country of great opportunities for the development of mind and life, no one denies. The difficulty is that the only way to find this out is through its citizens, and Americans (I speak of those who would best represent their country in the eyes of my people) seldom go near the Little Italys of their big cities." The saloon-keeper is the first in line, and next the corrupt ward politician, with his buying of votes, etc.

On the other side, the average American has the impression that the Italian colonies are dens of criminals. The yellow papers are to a large extent responsible for this. But the Italians themselves have a very unfavorable opinion of the customs and laws of America, as they continually see criminals with plenty of money escaping the penalty which is due them. "If the best Americans would teach to a large number of Italians the real freedom and nobility of this country and would help them, they would rise up as one man against the few criminals that dwell among them," says the author.

Discussing the subject of Americanization he makes several interesting remarks: "When I speak of Americanizing the foreigner I do not mean dwarfing the characteristics of one race in order to superimpose upon it the characteristics of another race. Americanization is this: making use of the best in the foreigner's nature, such as family love, religious spirit, love of country and humanity, by instilling in him a clear vision of the American nation, which was formed by men who had the same feelings that he has in his heart. Thus far America has not found to any appreciable extent the way of making itself known to the foreigner in its midst. * * * Among certain people there still exists the old prejudice that there must be something the matter with a foreigner. Exclusiveness on one side, loneliness on the other, do not help to interpret American life in the right spirit to the foreigner."

It will surely open the eyes of many Americans to read his remarks about social workers and the impressions they make upon the Italians. He asks the pertinent question: "Is it not curious

that there is scarcely one Italian at the head of a social betterment institution among his people in America? Social workers of Italian origin would understand how to avoid misunderstanding and mistakes, having the same feelings about the methods of work as the rest of their people."

Discussing the religious conditions of the Italian nation he says, quoting from Mazzini: "The religious sentiment sleeps in our people, waiting to be awakened. He who knows how to rouse it will do more for the nation than can be done by twenty political theories." The religious conditions of Italians in America reflect those existing in Italy: "I am not exaggerating when I say that 60% of Italian immigrants are completely free from the control of the Catholic Church. * * * They go from too much belief to unbelief, and when they cut loose from old traditions, they acquire all the vices that American city life makes easy without acquiring the virtues. This circumstance is what makes religious work among Italians so appealing and so much needed. * * * America as a nation offers the Italian immigrant a new citizenship and a new country, so the American churches should offer to unchurched people a simple Christianity and a spiritual leadership."

There are, in the book, a few minor inaccuracies and mistakes which may be easily corrected in a subsequent edition. What we most regret, however, is what we believe to be an error of judgment which the author shares in common with other Protestant writers, about former Roman Catholic priests who have joined the ranks of the Protestant ministry. The majority of the Italian people, we are persuaded, are likely to listen with more attention and respect to the preaching of a man who knows all about the Roman church, having been himself a priest, than to anyone else, if they are sure that the morality of the preacher was and is above criticism. In Italy itself, where the prejudices are stronger, one of the most successful Waldensian missions is the Church of Forano-Sabina, near Rome. The parish priest became the Protestant preacher in the very same town, and a large majority of the people followed him. He is pastor to this very day. He is a married man, and his wife is an American lady. Right here in America, Rev. Virgilio Guerra (who died a short time ago) had a great success as a Protestant preacher in

Providence, Rhode Island, where the Italians had known him as a Catholic priest for many years.

We could quote many other such instances out of a long experience, both in Italy and in this country, but we earnestly hope that the largely unjustified prejudice against a class of men to which, after all, Luther and Calvin themselves belonged, may soon completely disappear from the minds of all Protestants, who ought, rather, to sympathize with and encourage these brethren who are already suffering so much at the hand of their former church.

AGIDE PIRAZZINI.

TODAY'S WORLD PROBLEM IN DISEASE PREVENTION⁴

Publicity is a potent weapon in fighting many evils, provided the needed information comes from reliable sources and is wisely and vigorously used. Our government is fully awake to the perils that threaten from certain terrible diseases about which we have been too squeamish. Fortunately the day of assuming that ignorance must mean innocence and safety is passing, and the church is realizing its duty in the general crusade against evil of every kind.

The United States Public Health Service is seeking to enlist the aid of the ministry in its war against venereal disease. The book it has just issued, *To-day's World Problem in Disease Prevention*, was written by Dr. John H. Stokes, as a patriotic contribution to the government's health service. A circular letter from Surgeon General Blue states that it was originally prepared "for distribution to the ministers of the Gospel of all denominations," though the government is now giving it a still wider circulation. It is non-technical in language, and deals with its subject in a thorough-going way, giving the historical, physical, mental, moral, and social aspects of the matter.

In the course of his Introduction, Major W. A. Sawyer of the Medical Corps says concerning the changed attitude toward this source of peril and the plan to meet it:

"Out of the war, along with all the suffering and destruction, has come much good. One benefit has been a change of this attitude and the creation of an American plan for banishing the

⁴*Today's World Problem in Disease Prevention*, by John H. Stokes, A. B., M. D. Issued by the United States Public Health Service, Treasury Department, Washington, D. C., 1919. Pp. 136.

vast amount of ill-being and pain and death caused by venereal diseases. This American plan is an entirely new concept. It is not new in any one part, but new in its combination of all the consistent, worth-while methods, and new in that it squares with the highest American standards of upright living. And it is sound in its sociology as well as in its preventive and curative medicine.

"If the American plan is to live and develop steadily into a better and still more effective plan of the future, the people of America must understand it. The silence of the leaders must be broken and their mouths must utter the truth with understanding. The lawyer and the statesman, the teacher and the clergyman, need more than the selected data which are scattered about with popular propaganda. They should have ready access to those fundamental facts about venereal disease on which successful methods of control must rest. To present these facts Dr. Stokes has prepared this book. To make them widely available the United States Public Health Service has published a large edition and is sending it out to the teachers and leaders of the people—particularly the clergymen with their wonderful opportunities for warning, comforting, and advising."

After referring to the efforts of the government to protect the soldiers, and to the fact that most of the disease among the men in the draft army was found to have been contracted before they came into the camps, Major Sawyer points out that there was evidently a worse condition of things in the home town, than in the army environment. He continues:

"What was done to keep the soldier fit should be done year in and year out for the health, efficiency, and well-being of every young man and young woman of America. They must be taught, guided and protected, not only through individual attention, but especially by the correction of vicious influences in the community and the creation of an environment which is wholesome and stimulating to better living. The war has furnished a successful demonstration. May its lessons not be forgotten. * * *

"The first duty of all who wish to take a hand in the fight is to inform themselves so that they may lead and help others intelligently. And this brings me again to the volume which Dr. Stokes has prepared, not so much for the benefit of the readers themselves as for the welfare of the much larger body which will be influenced through their words, example, and direct assistance."

A free copy of this book will be mailed to any minister who addresses The Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, Washington, D. C., and asks for it by the title given

here. This is not only an opportunity for securing the best information upon the essentials of a most vitally important subject, but it affords a chance for that Christian service which seeks the good of the entire individual, soul and body, and the benefit of the community where he dwells.